

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be made the pending business for tomorrow. There will be no action taken on the measure this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House, and that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills during the adjournment of the Senate until noon, October 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the

order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 1, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 30, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. MARSHAL

Leonard T. Heckathorn, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. ATTORNEY

H. Moody Brickett, of Montana, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30, 1965:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

William H. Stewart, of Maryland, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Josef Nordenhaug, general secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, offered the following prayer:

Psalm 143: 8: *Let me hear in the morning of Thy steadfast love, for in Thee I put my trust. Teach me the way I should go, for to Thee I lift up my soul.*

Let us pray:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that the way to Thee is open. Give us now an awareness of Thy presence, and faith to respond to Thy beckoning.

We declare our utter dependence on Thee and confess our failures and limitations. We seek Thy forgiveness for the past and resources for the obligations of the future.

We do not shrink back from the burdens of this turbulent age, but are grateful that Thou hast matched us with this hour.

We intercede for our Nation and all the peoples of the earth. Guide us by Thy Spirit to find the way of peace and righteousness and to walk in it.

May the peace of God guard our hearts and minds through Christ Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On September 14, 1965:

H.R. 4465. An act to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia.

On September 15, 1965:

H.R. 1443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olga Bernice Bramson Gilfillan;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of Esterina Ricupero;

H.R. 1820. An act for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon;

H.R. 2678. An act for the relief of Joo Yul Kim;

H.R. 2871. An act for the relief of Dorota Zytka;

H.R. 3292. An act for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus;

H.R. 5024. An act to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6719. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuyo Watanabe Ridgely; and

H.R. 9570. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner.

On September 16, 1965:

H.R. 10775. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

On September 17, 1965:

H.R. 725. An act to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters;

H.R. 727. An act to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band; and

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona.

On September 21, 1965:

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro;

H.R. 3039. An act to amend 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due;

H.R. 5989. An act to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883); and

H.R. 8351. An act for the relief of Clarence L. Alu and others.

On September 22, 1965:

H.R. 8027. An act to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8333. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by

members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations; and H.R. 10586. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On September 25, 1965:

H.R. 1892. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 7779. An act to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve;

H.R. 8761. An act to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H.R. 10323. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

On September 27, 1965:

H.R. 6431. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty; and

H.R. 8469. An act to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

On September 29, 1965:

H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi;

H.R. 3684. An act for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 8218. An act for the relief of Walter K. Willis;

H.R. 9221. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10014. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives, and the act of June 27, 1956, relating to office space in the States of Senators; and

H.R. 10874. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to eliminate certain provisions which reduce spouses' annuities, to provide coverage for tips, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the railroad retirement tax rates.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 596. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-6.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1966

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana

[Mr. PASSMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10871), the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMEND TITLE V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9336) to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 501 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643) is amended by striking out 'which have arisen out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or'.

"Sec. 2. Section 503(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643(a)) is amended by striking out 'arising out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or'.

"Sec. 3. Section 505(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643d) is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof as follows: 'A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon a debt or other obligation owing by any corporation, association, or other entity organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be considered, only when such debt or other obligation is a charge on property which has been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba.'

"Sec. 4. Section 506 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643e) is amended by striking out: 'Provided, That the deduction of such amounts shall not be construed as divesting the United States of any rights against the Government of Cuba for the amounts so deducted'.

"Sec. 5. Section 511 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643j) is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to pay its administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, I will be very happy to explain them.

Mr. HALL. I should be glad to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. As you will recall, this bill passed the House earlier without any

objection. When it got to the other body three amendments were added. The first amendment pertains to the decisions of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In addition to the written decision, a statement of the evidence relied upon and the reasoning employed in reaching the decision is required.

In the House version that language was not included. The other body decided to put it back in. We felt that a documented explanation of claims determination was actually calling for too much detail, but the other body insisted on it.

Mr. HALL. It really was just a question of having conforming technical language?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. The other matter which is more substantive had to do with the limitation on the House side on the authorization, not to exceed \$750,000. The Senate removed the limitation and inserted a general authorization. We cannot conceive any reason why the administrative expenses for the program should go beyond \$750,000 to \$1 million. It is our intention that they should not.

Therefore we had no particular objection to the removal of the limitation although I am frank to say that I would much prefer to stay within the limitation.

Mr. HALL. Is the gentleman now advising the House that this is open ended so far as expenses of the Commission are concerned?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes. The authorization limitation has been removed. I should like to say to the gentleman that I am not unduly concerned about that because, as we know, it still has to go through the appropriations process. These are administrative expenses for processing, for personnel, et cetera, which we can keep under careful scrutiny. It is our purpose in the authorizing committee to do that.

So, as I say, I am not unduly concerned on that score.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's making that legislative record. We are constantly aware that these authorizations come back to haunt us in the appropriations process. We have to lay one off against the other. We would certainly hope that we never just tacitly agree to open-ended authorizations of appropriation.

Mr. FASCELL. I understand the gentleman's feeling.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Even though the total limitation has been removed, my impression from the colloquy taking place is that those who are administering the program shall be required, according to the words of the gentleman from Florida, to have in effect an administrative ceiling on the handling of this particular program; is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. I can tell you why this came about. The best estimates on administrative cost ran somewhere between \$750,000 and

\$1 million. I think that is the reason that the other body decided to remove the limitation. We had intended to stay within those figures and certainly I should think \$750,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his contribution, and I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there is one other amendment to which I might refer. This has to do with creditor claims. Such claims must be evidenced by a charge on the property taken. This was not in the House version because we could not get an agreement as to how creditors could file separate claims. The other body, the executive agencies concurring, would allow creditors to file separate claims where that credit was secured by a property interest.

That is what this amendment does. We believe it is a good amendment. Therefore, we ask the House to concur in it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not intended by reference to a takeover date in this legislation to give the Government of Cuba the advantage of any statute of limitations defense not asserted prior to the takeover date.

Furthermore, the amendments are not intended to deprive an American claimant of a legitimate element of its claim and provide a windfall to the Cuban Government. Services rendered or merchandise furnished in intercompany transactions regardless of their date ought to be considered, even though legal steps were not taken to establish these debts and to prevent the running of the statute of limitations. For example, claims based on transactions between an American supply company operating in Cuba through its wholly owned Cuban subsidiary where goods have been delivered over a long period of years prior to 1959 and payment has not been received, nor legal action taken to reduce the debt to judgment or otherwise establish it through judicial proceedings, should be considered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for his explanation. It is entirely satisfactory. But now the House has this information to which we will agree by unanimous consent, although I still have some reservation about the second portion of the amendment which is on open-ended funding, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"CANBERRA" WEEK

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Concurrent Resolution 508, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 508

Whereas the United States ship *Canberra* is the only cruiser in American naval history to bear the name of a foreign city; and

Whereas the United States ship *Canberra* was chosen to be one of the first guided-missile cruisers in the world; and

Whereas the United States ship *Canberra* has been in the service of the United States Navy for over twenty years and established a record of which all Americans can be justly proud; and

Whereas the United States ship *Canberra* is currently in service as part of the effort to stem the tide of Communist aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside the eight-day period beginning October 10, 1965, as "Canberra Week" in honor of all those who have served, and are serving, the cause of freedom as officers and members of the crew of the United States ship *Canberra*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 340]

Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Morris
Andrews,	Dorn	Morton
George W.	Dow	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews,	Duncan, Oreg.	Powell
Glenn	Frelinghuysen	Rivers, Alaska
Ashley	Goodell	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Robison
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Roncallo
Bolton	Hardy	Scott
Bonner	Hathaway	Sickles
Brown, Calif.	Hollifield	Talcott
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Okla.	Thomas
Carter	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Colmer	Long, La.	Toll
Daddario	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Dawson	Mize	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was

read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, which was held at Geneva, Switzerland, from August 31 to September 9, 1964, yielded much evidence that the world is on the threshold of an exciting new era of nuclear power. The work of the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna, since its establishment in 1957, has contributed to the development of the capabilities of many countries to cross this threshold. The programs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as they were carried forward during 1964, gave promise that the Agency will contribute in growing measure over future years to the application of the atom to the constructive works of man.

Particularly noteworthy was the progress made by the International Atomic Energy Agency during 1964 in laying the foundations for restricting the use of nuclear energy exclusively to peaceful purposes. In February 1964 the Agency adopted a system of safeguards, applicable to all nuclear reactors, designed to guard against the diversion of nuclear materials to military use. In September 1964 the Agency's Director General reported that agreements had been negotiated with 17 of the 38 countries of the world possessing nuclear reactors, whereby some or all of their nuclear facilities would be placed under the safeguards of the Agency.

The United States has supported these activities, and looks to the Agency to play an increasingly significant role in developing the use of atomic energy for the benefit of the peoples of the world. U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency during the year 1964 is the subject of this eighth annual report which I am transmitting to the Congress pursuant to the provisions of the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 30, 1965.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, PUBLIC HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes,

and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1101)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a) Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), and of the immediate relatives of United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of this section, the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or who may, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) enter conditionally, (1) shall not in any of the first three quarters of any fiscal year exceed a total of 45,000 and (2) shall not in any fiscal year exceed a total of 170,000.

"(b) The 'immediate relatives' referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall mean the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of parents, such citizen must be at least twenty-one years of age. The immediate relatives specified in this subsection who are otherwise qualified for admission as immigrants shall be admitted as such, without regard to the numerical limitations in this Act.

"(c) During the period from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1968, the annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area on June 30, 1965. The Secretary of State shall, not later than on the sixtieth day immediately following the date of enactment of this subsection and again on or before September 1, 1966, and September 1, 1967, determine and proclaim the amount of quota numbers which remain unused at the end of the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, respectively, and are available for distribution pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with subsection (c) hereof, shall be transferred to an immigration pool. Allocation of numbers from the pool and from national quotas shall not together exceed in any fiscal year the numerical limitations in subsection (a) of this section. The immigration pool shall be made available to immigrants otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of a preference visa due to oversubscription of their quotas, or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State. Visas and conditional entries shall be allocated from the immigration pool within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable.

"(e) The immigration pool and the quotas of quota areas shall terminate June 30, 1968. Thereafter immigrants admissible under the provisions of this Act who are subject to the numerical limitations of subsection (a) of this section shall be admitted in accordance with the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203.

"Sec. 2. Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No person shall receive any preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence, except as specifically provided in section 101(a)(27), section 201(b), and section 203: *Provided*, That the total number of immigrant visas and the number of conditional entries made available to natives of any single foreign state under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000 in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not operate to reduce the number of immigrants who may be admitted under the quota of any quota area before June 30, 1968.

"(b) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions shall be treated as a separate foreign state for the purposes of the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a foreign state specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act the foreign state to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within such foreign state except that (1) an alien child, when accompanied by his alien parent or parents, may be charged to the same foreign state as the accompanying parent or of either accompanying parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the accompanying parent or parents, and if the foreign state to which such parent has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (2) if an alien is chargeable to a different foreign state from that of his accompanying spouse, the foreign state to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the foreign state of the accompanying spouse, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the foreign state to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer; (4) an alien born within any foreign state in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the foreign state of either parent.

"(c) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a foreign state unless a special immigrant as provided in section 101(a)(27) or an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b), shall be chargeable, for the purpose of limitation set forth in section 202(a), to the foreign state, except that the number of persons born in any such colony or other component or depend-

ent area overseas from the foreign state chargeable to the foreign state in any one fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the maximum number of immigrant visas available to such foreign state.

"(d) In the case of any change in the territorial limits of foreign states, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all diplomatic and consular offices.

"Sec. 3. Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. (a) Aliens who are subject to the numerical limitations specified in section 201(a) shall be allotted visas or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be, as follows:

"(1) Visas shall be first made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(2) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraph (1), to qualified immigrants who are the spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(3) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(4) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (3), to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 24 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) Conditional entries shall next be made available by the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe and in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(1), to aliens who satisfy an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist-dominated country, (A) that (i) because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion they have fled (I) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, or (II) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and (ii) are unable or unwilling to return to such country or area on account of race, religion, or political opinion, and (iii) are not nationals of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made; or (B) that they are persons uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity as defined by the President who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. For the purpose of the foregoing the term 'general area of the Middle East' means the area between and including (1) Libya on the west, (2) Turkey on the north,

(3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south: *Provided*, That immigrant visas in a number not exceeding one-half the number specified in this paragraph may be made available, in lieu of conditional entries of a like number, to such aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of at least two years prior to application for adjustment of status.

"(8) Visas authorized in any fiscal year, less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) and less the number of conditional entries and visas made available pursuant to paragraph (7), shall be made available to other qualified immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which they qualify. Waiting lists of applicants shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this paragraph, or to an immigrant with a preference under paragraph (3) or (6) of this subsection, until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (14).

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b) (1) (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa or to conditional entry under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), if accompanying, or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(b) In considering applications for immigrant visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given to applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(c) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a), or to a special immigrant status under section 101(a) (27), or that he is an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b) or to be entitled to preference immigrant status under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(e) For the purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State is authorized to make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories of subsection (a), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of such visas. The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed.

"(f) The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a report containing complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of each alien who conditionally entered the United States pursuant to subsection (a) (7) of this section. Such reports shall be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year.

"(g) Any alien who conditionally entered the United States as a refugee, pur-

suant to subsection (a) (7) of this section, whose conditional entry has not been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, who has been in the United States for at least two years, and who has not acquired permanent residence, shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and shall thereupon be inspected and examined for admission into the United States, and his case dealt with in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237 of this Act.

"(h) Any alien who, pursuant to subsection (g) of this section, is found, upon inspection by the immigration officer or after hearing before a special inquiry officer, to be admissible as an immigrant under this Act at the time of his inspection and examination, except for the fact that he was not and is not in possession of the documents required by section 212(a) (20), shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival.

"Sec. 4. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (5) of section 203(a), or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a) (2), or any alien desiring to be classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) (3) (or any person on behalf of such an alien), or any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) (6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer or an immigration officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor with respect to petitions to accord a status under section 203(a) (3) or (6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is an immediate relative specified in section 201(b) or is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b) (1) (E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under sections 203(a) (3) or 203(a) (6) stating the basis for

his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) or as an immediate relative under section 201(b) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification.

"Sec. 5. Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176; 8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236.

"Sec. 6. Section 206 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1156) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission to the United States and deported, or does not apply for admission before the expiration of the validity of his visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa or a preference immigrant visa, as the case may be, may be issued in lieu thereof to another qualified alien.

"Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1157) is stricken.

"Sec. 8. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

"(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term "special immigrant" means—

"(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying, or following to join him: *Provided*, That no immigrant visa shall be issued pursuant to this clause until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (14);

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section 324(a) or 327 of title III, apply for reacquisition of citizenship;

"(D) (i) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and whose services are needed by such religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the United States; and (ii) the spouse or

the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him; or

"(E) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful service for a total of fifteen years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children: *Provided*, That the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment, in his discretion, shall have recommended the granting of special immigrant status to such alien in exceptional circumstances and the Secretary of State approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status."

"(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

"(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child, under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence: *Provided*, That no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

"Sec. 9. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a) (20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a) (27) (B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit or other documentation."

"Sec. 10. Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

"(a) Paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows:

"Allies seeking to enter the United States, for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient workers in

the United States who are able, willing, qualified, and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and (B) the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply to special immigrants defined in section 101(a) (27) (A) (other than the parents, spouses, or children of United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), to preference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a) (3) and (6), and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a) (8);"

"(b) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the letter '(e)' and substituting therefor the letter '(a)'."

"(c) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word 'quota'."

"(d) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: 'other than aliens described in section 101(a) (27) (A) and (B)'."

"Sec. 11. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words 'the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant,' and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'the preference, nonpreference, immediate relative, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged.'"

"(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 221(c) is amended by deleting the word 'quota' preceding the word 'number;' the word 'quota' preceding the word 'year;' and the words 'a quota' preceding the word 'immigrant,' and substituting in lieu thereof the word 'an'."

"(c) Section 222(a) is amended by deleting the words 'preference quota or a nonquota immigrant' and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) or a preference or special immigrant'."

"(d) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: 'A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant or immediate relative as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under this Act, that the applicant is entitled to special immigrant or immediate relative status.'"

"(e) Section 241(a) (10) is amended by substituting for the words 'Section 101(a) (27) (C)' the words 'Section 101(a) (27) (A)'."

"(f) Section 243(h) is amended by striking out 'physical persecution' and inserting in lieu thereof 'persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion'."

"Sec. 12. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (d) is amended to read:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a) (27) (A), or is an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) (8) for the fiscal year then current."

"(b) Subsection (f) is amended by inserting after the language 'entered the United States as a crewman' the language 'subsequent to June 30, 1964;'"

"Sec. 13. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

"(b) Subsection (c) is amended to read:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is a native of any country of the Western Hemisphere or of any adjacent island named in section 101(b) (5)."

"Sec. 14. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

"(a) Immediately after 'Sec. 281.' insert '(a)';"

"(b) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204 and section 214(c), \$10; and";

"(c) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"(b) The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State; and

"(d) The paragraph beginning with the words 'The fees * * *' is designated subsection (c)."

"Sec. 15. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a) (1)) is amended by deleting the language 'feebleminded' and inserting the language 'mentally retarded' in its place.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a) (4)) is amended by deleting the word 'epilepsy' and substituting the words 'or sexual deviation'."

"(c) Sections 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655; 8 U.S.C. 1182), are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212 (g) as so redesignated is amended by inserting before the words 'afflicted with tuberculosis in any form' the following: 'who is excludable from the United States under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, or any alien' and by adding at the end of such subsection the following sentence: 'Any alien excludable under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section because of past history of mental illness who has one of the same family relationships as are prescribed in this subsection for aliens afflicted with tuberculosis and whom the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service finds to have been free of such mental illness for a period of time sufficient in the light of such history to demonstrate recovery shall be eligible for a visa in accordance with the terms of this subsection.'"

"Sec. 16. Sections 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504-505), as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), are repealed.

"Sec. 17. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192; 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: 'Provided further, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a) (15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt

of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

"Sec. 18. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226; 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words 'shall pay to the collector of customs' is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, or with sexual deviation, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict."

"Sec. 19. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 219; 8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended by striking out 'June 28, 1940' in clause (a) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1948.'

"Sec. 20. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of its enactment except as provided herein.

"Sec. 21. (a) There is hereby established a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') to be composed of fifteen members. The President shall appoint the Chairman of the Commission and four other members thereof. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint five members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint five members from the membership of the House. Not more than three members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be members of the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

"(b) The Commission shall study the following matters:

"(1) Prevailing and projected demographic, technological, and economic trends, particularly as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations;

"(2) Present and projected unemployment in the United States, by occupations, industries, geographic areas and other factors, in relation to immigration from the Western Hemisphere;

"(3) The interrelationships between immigration, present and future, and existing and contemplated national and international programs and projects of Western Hemisphere nations, including programs and projects for economic and social development;

"(4) The operation of the immigration laws of the United States as they pertain to Western Hemisphere nations, including the adjustment of status for Cuban refugees, with emphasis on the adequacy of such laws from the standpoint of fairness and from the standpoint of the impact of such laws on employment and working conditions within the United States;

"(5) The implications of the foregoing with respect to the security and international relations of Western Hemisphere nations; and

"(6) Any other matters which the Commission believes to be germane to the purposes for which it was established.

"(c) On or before July 1, 1967, the Commission shall make a first report to the President and the Congress, and on or before January 15, 1968, the Commission shall make a final report to the President and the Congress. Such reports shall include the recommendations of the Commission as to what changes, if any, are needed in the immigration laws in the light of its study. The Commission's recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, recommendations as to whether, and if so how, numerical limitations should be imposed upon immigration to the United States from the nations of the Western Hemisphere. In formulating its recommendations on the latter subject, the Commission shall give particular attention to the impact of such immigration on employment and working conditions within the United States and to the necessity of preserving the special relationship of the United States with its sister Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

"(d) The life of the Commission shall expire upon the filing of its final report, except that the Commission may continue to function for up to sixty days thereafter for the purpose of winding up its affairs.

"(e) Unless legislation inconsistent herewith is enacted on or before June 30, 1968, in response to recommendations of the Commission or otherwise, the number of special immigrants within the meaning of section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, exclusive of special immigrants who are immediate relatives of United States citizens as described in section 201(b) of that Act, shall not, in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, or in any fiscal year thereafter, exceed a total of 120,000.

"(f) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

"(g) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$100 for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended. Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 22 (a). The designation of chapter 1, title II, is amended to read as follows: 'CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM'.

"(b) The title preceding section 201 is amended to read as follows: 'NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS'.

"(c) The title preceding section 202 is amended to read as follows: 'NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE'.

"(d) The title preceding section 203 is amended to read as follows: 'ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(e) The title preceding section 204 is amended to read as follows: 'PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS'.

"(f) The title preceding section 205 is amended to read as follows: 'REVOCATION OF APPROVAL OF PETITIONS'.

"(g) The title preceding section 206 is amended to read as follows: 'UNUSED IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(h) The title preceding section 207 is repealed.

"(i) The title preceding section 224 of chapter 3, title II, is amended to read as follows: 'IMMEDIATE RELATIVE AND SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS'.

"(j) The title preceding section 249 is amended to read as follows: 'RECORD OF ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1924, OR JUNE 30, 1948.'

"Sec. 23. (a) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations.

"Sec. 202. Numerical limitation to any single foreign state.

"Sec. 203. Allocation of immigrant visas.

"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status.

"Sec. 205. Revocation of approval of petitions.

"Sec. 206. Unused immigrant visas."

"(b) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended by changing the designation of section 224 to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Immediate relative and special immigrant visas."

"(c) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter 5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by changing the designation of section 249 to read as follows:

"Sec. 249. Record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, or June 30, 1948."

"Sec. 24. Paragraph (6) of section 101(b) is repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
PETER W. ROBIN, JR.,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JACK B. BROOKS,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
WILLIAM T. CAHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.,
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
PHILIP A. HART,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
HIRAM FONG,
JACOB K. JAVITS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2580 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House passed H.R. 2580 and the Senate then substituted the provisions it had adopted by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provision. The Senate insisted upon its version and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference. The conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House version and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert in lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment the matter agreed to by the conferees, and that the Senate agree thereto. The conference report contains substantially the language of the House version with certain exceptions which are explained below.

(1) As passed by the House the bill provided in section 203(a)(7) that not more

than 10,200 refugees from communism and from the general area of the Middle East may be granted conditional entries each year. As amended by the Senate, the definition of refugees was enlarged to include aliens who have been uprooted from their usual place of abode by a catastrophic natural calamity. The conferees agreed to adopt the Senate provision.

(2) The conferees have agreed to provide in section 4 of the bill that immigration officers as well as consular officers may administer oaths executed outside of the United States. This section conforms with existing law.

(3) The House bill contained in section 11 a provision requiring the President to report to the Congress in the event the number of immigrants admitted from the Western Hemisphere exceeded in any one fiscal year by 10 per centum or more the average number admitted in the previous 5 fiscal years. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. In order to conform to a new section 21 which provides for the establishment of a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration the conferees agreed to the deletion of the House provision.

(4) The Senate amendment provided that the Attorney General, in his discretion, could suspend deportation of alien crewmen and adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents under the procedure provided in section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The House bill contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to the Senate version with an amendment precluding such suspension of deportation for those alien crewmen who entered subsequent to June 30, 1964.

(5) The House bill provided in section 13 that natives of any countries of the Western Hemisphere or of an adjacent island shall be ineligible for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 245. The Senate amendment exempted from this provision aliens born in an independent country of the Western Hemisphere who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion, is out of his usual place of abode and unable to return thereto. The conferees agreed to accept the House provision.

(6) Section 15 of the House bill provided for a discretionary waiver of exclusion based upon mental retardation for children under the age of 14 when accompanying their United States citizen or permanent resident alien parents into the United States. The Senate version provides a discretionary waiver for any person excludable because of mental retardation who is a relative as defined in the redesignated section 212(g). The conference report adopts the Senate version.

(7) The conferees agreed to adopt the House version of section 17 and agreed to delete the Senate amendment thereto which provided that an alien student must submit evidence that he will be admitted and regularly enrolled as a student at an approved educational institution. Such requirement is substantially in existing law.

(8) Section 19 of the Senate amendment has no equivalent in the House bill. The Senate amendment extended the benefits of section 249 to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission to aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1958. The conferees agreed to adjust the date provided in the Senate amendment to June 30, 1948.

9. Section 21 of the Senate amendment has no equivalent in the House bill. The conferees have adopted this provision which establishes a conditional limitation of 120,000 upon the Western Hemisphere and establishes a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration composed of fifteen members with an amendment to provide that five members thereto be appointed respec-

tively by the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the stipulation that not more than three of the members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively, shall be members of the same political party. The conferees added to the matters to be studied by the Select Commission specific reference to the matter of adjustment of status of Cuban refugees in the United States.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
FRANK CHELF,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
JACK B. BROOKS,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
ARCH A. MOORE, Jr.,
WILLIAM T. CAHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] 30 minutes and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, immigration is the most forceful factor in the development of the United States. We need immigration in order to magnify the uses of our great resources, physical, moral, and spiritual. Our greatness as a nation, a nation that soon will have a gross national product of \$700 billion, with the highest standard of living, was made possible in good part because of immigration.

We started with about 5 million people. Now we are over 194 million. That demographic growth was not all from within. It was also from accretion abroad. Since 1820, 43 million immigrants have come to the United States from all over the world. We drew up a great reservoir of alien brain and brawn. We shall continue to do so.

My grandparents came here from Germany in the 1840's. Driven by poverty and persecution they came, with thousands of others, to build our railroads, canals, bridges, roads and buildings, and later subways and skyscrapers. They made parched land blossom. Out of slums emerged anxious men and women to create our industries and the unions and to promote the arts and sciences.

Consider some of the illustrious names of our glittering roster of Members: ADAMO, ROONEY, FARBER, DULSKI, MATSUNAGA, DE LA GARZA, RODINO, KLUCZYNSKI, BRADEMANS, O'HARA, ST. ONGE, KASTENMEIER. They run the gamut of all nationalities and climes.

Their progenitors struggled and strived so that those who followed them could go to the university, enter professions and industry, and even to Congress.

These early ones did not know Pocahontas or Myles Standish. They were not in the Social Register nor the Ivy League. Some came here in steerage, and as they sailed up New York Harbor and peeped out of portholes, they hailed, with joy in their hearts, the Statue of Liberty, where President Johnson, I hope, will sign this bill.

They are the alien warp and woof of America triumphant. The exodus out of Europe was polyglot and heterogeneous. The people of all nations and all races helped build our great Nation.

That is why we have struck down the national origins system of immigration which dealt unfairly with certain peoples. It was a most ungracious way of treating certain races which had been good to us.

We shall have scrapped this obsolete false notion of national origins entirely by July 1968 when all nations outside the Western Hemisphere shall be allotted a total of 170,000 immigrant visas—with no one country receiving more than 20,000 visas—while nations within the Western Hemisphere shall be allotted 120,000 immigrant visas annually, all on a first-come, first-served basis.

For the 3 years that the national origins theory shall remain in effect all unused quotas will no longer go to waste, but will be transferred to countries that have low quotas under the old law, like Italy, Greece, Spain, Romania, Holland, and so on. In addition, an estimated 60,000 parents, children or spouses of U.S. citizens will be admitted annually regardless of nationality or quota. The numbers that will come will not be much above those presently coming, but the distribution among nations will be equitable and fair.

The bill passed the House, but there were some changes in the Senate. The committee on conference has reconciled the differences. We did not emerge from the conference with all we desire, nor did the Senate. It was a conference—the usual give and take. If you want the rainbow, you must take the rain. If you want the rose, you must put up with the thorns.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to thank my fellow conferees for their indefatigable application to this painstaking job. We worked in a thoroughly cooperative spirit. I wish to thank Messrs. FEIGHAN, CHELF, RODINO, DONOHUE, BROOKS, McCULLOCH, MOORE, and CAHILL.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides as follows:

With reference to refugees, the number permissible is 10,200. We widened the definition of refugee to include victims of natural calamities, which was not in the House bill. Thus, victims of earthquakes, floods and tornadoes will be included but the number of refugees is not increased.

We set up a Select Commission of 15 Members on Western Hemisphere Immigration, to be composed of 5 Members from the House, 5 Members from the Senate, and 5 members to be appointed by the President. No more than three of the members appointed by the Speaker or the President of the Senate shall be members of one party.

Immigration officers as well as consular officers may administer oaths outside the United States. This conforms to existing laws.

The Senate bill had a provision that the Attorney General could suspend the deportation of alien crewmen and adjust their status to lawful permanent residents. The House bill had no such provision. The conferees agreed to the Senate version with an amendment precluding suspension of deportation of those seamen who entered subsequent to June

30, 1964. But before the status of those individuals can be thus adjusted, they would have to show hardship and establish that for 7 years they had been leading law-abiding and moral lives.

The Senate version had a provision to adjust the status of natives of the Western Hemisphere, now in the United States, who fled from their native country because of Communist persecution or the fear of persecution. This refers to the Cuban refugees of which there are about 200,000 in the United States. The conferees deleted the Senate provision but added that the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration shall address itself to this matter and report to the Congress.

The House version provided a discretionary waiver of exclusion based upon the mental retardation of children 14 years of age or younger, when accompanied by a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident alien parent. We extended the waiver to include all persons regardless of age.

The Senate provision permitted legalization of the status of those aliens improperly in the United States who entered prior to June 28, 1958. The conferees agreed to adjust the date to June 30, 1948.

The present law provides for adjustment of status if the entry was before 1940. The conferees extended the period 8 years.

The House version had no ceiling on admissions from the Western Hemisphere. The Senate provided a limitation of 120,000 immigration visas annually to all countries of the Western Hemisphere. It was felt that since countries outside the Western Hemisphere had limitations or a ceiling, the same might well apply to countries of the Western Hemisphere.

With only two exceptions, all conferees signed the conference report.

There was the strongest bipartisan support for this conference report.

I believe the bill is a fair bill. As I said a moment ago, it does not contain everything that we had hoped to get, but it is the best we could get under the circumstances.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the splendid explanation that the chairman has given. There were two subjects to which he did not address himself, about which I understood there had been some discussion. I do not want to take a lot of time, but I wonder if the chairman would comment on the provision which I understood had been considered to give the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the Secretary of Labor, authority in the field of the admission of seasonal migrant workers.

Mr. CELLER. That was not in either bill and thus not in issue in the conference.

Mr. WHITENER. Very well. I understood there was some effort to change the deportation rules to provide that if an alien had been in this country for 10 years or longer, he could not be subject

to deportation because of some entry that was made which was in violation of the present law.

Mr. CELLER. There was no discussion of any statute of limitations, because such a provision was not in either bill. The law as it exists today remains in that regard.

Mr. WHITENER. Notwithstanding the time an alien has been in this country, he would still be subject to deportation if it appeared that back in his youth he had been charged with some offense?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary yielding. I, too, in general would compliment the conferees under the chairman on bringing back this report, an excellent report, to the floor of the House.

Quite naturally my question pertains to numbered paragraph 6, or section 15 of the House bill, involving the discretionary waiver of mental retardedness. Would the chairman explain if that provision involves also mental deficiency in the range of mental disorders?

Mr. CELLER. So far as I understand the situation, it is limited to what is known to the medical profession as mental retardation. There is provision for waiver of a prior attack of insanity if the Public Health Service certifies that the alien has recovered.

Mr. HALL. This is a very important point. I appreciate the gentleman's response.

Will the Senate version, which was accepted by the conferees, still require certification by the proper physician of the overseas Public Health Service?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. There is no change in that regard.

Mr. HALL. Would the distinguished gentleman estimate that the bill will cut down on the number of private bills for the immigration of the mentally ill and/or mental retardedness?

Mr. CELLER. I think it should cut down the number.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Frankly, I do not think we have very many of that kind of case. I am informed that there are about 40 private bills a year of that type introduced.

Mr. HALL. On some days when they are before us on the Private Calendar, they seem overly large in number.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may be correct. I am speaking from memory. Perhaps my memory is faulty.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my distinguished chairman. I have a question with respect to an item that the House, as I recall, voted down and the Senate incorporated by way of an amendment. That provision has to do with quota determinations for the Western Hemisphere. I wonder if the gentleman could

describe exactly the tenor of the changes in this act with respect to Western Hemisphere immigration.

Mr. CELLER. There is no quota placed on any country of the Western Hemisphere. We simply placed a total ceiling on all countries in the Western Hemisphere at 120,000 immigration visas a year. That is exclusive of what we call visas granted to immediate relatives, that is, children, spouses, and parents of American citizens.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Is this not contradictory to the whole body of tradition, especially in view of the overall philosophy we have employed in selling this bill? Now it seems as if we are erecting a wall, rather than reducing walls, which we originally intended to do.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may remember that I was very strongly in favor of no ceiling on the Western Hemisphere when the bill was discussed in the House originally. I had taken my cue from the administration in that regard.

The gentleman on the other side [Mr. MACGREGOR] offered an amendment to impose a ceiling, and on a teller vote we lost. The ceiling would have been imposed. On a record vote, the result was very close. I believe the teller vote was disturbed, if I remember correctly, by only some eight votes. So I would say the House is fairly divided on the subject of whether there should or should not be a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

As the gentleman knows, when we get into a conference one cannot dictate exactly what the result will be. It is necessary to consult with all of the conferees and not only with the House conferees. In this situation we found that the position of the Republican House conferees was consistent with the views of Mr. MACGREGOR and also with the Senate conferees, and thus the situation was placed in a little different light.

So, as I said before, after working it out, hemming and hawing and arguing back and forth, we finally came to the conclusion, in order to get something done, that we should do this. Otherwise, we would have found ourselves in a situation which would be the rock on which the conference would split. Rather than have no bill, I had to reluctantly, personally, yield.

I deeply sympathize with the gentleman's point of view. I agree with his point of view. But I could not have my views prevail. I knew when I was licked.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I understand, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly wish to compliment the chairman on the fact that he has unequivocally stated his position on this issue. That is the reason why I wanted to know more of the details of what transpired.

Mr. CELLER. May I add one more point?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CELLER. We did set up the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, to be composed of 15 members. This matter of Western Hemisphere immigration impinges upon foreign policy, and the Executive naturally should have some direction in this

matter. Congress should have some direction. We await with interest what this Commission will report. They are to study all phases of this question, and they will report to the Congress.

At some subsequent time, if it is essential to make changes, we can make changes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I have one more question. I do not know that I personally can accept the compromise which, by the very nature of his position, the distinguished chairman saw fit to accept.

Mr. CELLER. I want to tell the gentleman that we have a limited time, and I should like to be sure that the other side gets time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Briefly, I have a question with regard to page 8 of the report. Section 9 relates to section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and section 211(a) in the paragraph containing the amendment includes "under the regulations issued by the Attorney General."

I was wondering if the chairman could explain this amendment, on page 8 of the report.

Mr. CELLER. We are on the conference report?

Mr. GONZALEZ. On the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Page 8 of the conference report?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Page 8 of the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. What paragraph are you referring to?

Mr. GONZALEZ. The very first one, section 211(a). It reads:

Sec. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued.

Mr. CELLER. I say it is existing law, and we make no change in it. No change whatsoever.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is what I wanted to get. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], a member of the committee.

Mr. GILBERT. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my distinguished chairman for the work he has done on this bill. As a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the committee, I wish to point out to the chairman that I am personally gravely disappointed that the conferees of the House capitulated so quickly to the Senate version with respect to placing the limitation of 120,000 on the Western Hemisphere. I think it was only last week that the House adopted a resolution which poked a finger right in the eye of all of Latin

America. I think now, by the inclusion of the adoption of a limitation or quota on the Western Hemisphere, we are taking the finger and poking it into the other eye of Latin America. I am sorely disappointed at the actions of the conferees with respect to this particular point. I hope it does not adversely affect our relations with all of Latin and South America.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I very much want to take this opportunity to say to the House that the conference report we are considering at this time is basically the House position in every respect with one major exception, that is, we have included the ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration at 120,000, which was discussed in the committee in the House at the time it was submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

I think it is fair to say to the Members of the House that in each of the areas in which there were matters in difference between that which we passed in this body and the action which was performed by the other body, that in almost every respect the position of the House was maintained. I think if you will recall the original debate on the changes which were suggested in our immigration policy at the time of consideration of the legislation in the House, that there was some real concern as to whether the House or, I should say, the two bodies of the Congress, would continue to exercise control over the Nation's immigration policy.

I think that this conference report has confirmed once and for all that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States shall continue to exert their constitutional control over the immigration policy of our country. This is particularly significant in the make-up of the Commission on the Western Hemisphere which is created by this bill as passed by the other body. Initially they suggested it be a 15-man Commission, 9 members to be appointed by the President of the United States and 3 to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and 3 by the President of the Senate.

An amendment was agreed to by the conferees which would provide for the Commission to be made up of 15 members, but that the President would appoint 5 and each of the two bodies of the legislative branch of the Government would appoint 5, giving, I believe, without question, full control over the Commission to those of us in the legislative branch of the Government who are given the responsibility constitutionally in this area.

I think what should be said here today with respect to the changes that we have made and contemplate by the passage and acceptance of this conference report is simply this. When anyone in your constituency asks you about our immigration policies, about the number of immigrants that are coming into this country, I think for the first time you can honestly say what the number will

be coming into this Nation, or what the maximum ceiling is on annual immigration.

Heretofore our immigration flow into this country was from any one of a number of eight different areas and it was, I would say, extremely difficult to anticipate what would happen under the authority written into the law as to the number of people that could actually come into our country in any given area.

And let me use the Western Hemisphere for example. While the annual average over the past 10 years has been 110,000, with severe increases in the last 5 years it should be restated that there was no ceiling. In any one year it could easily go up to a quarter of a million or as many as half a million. In our refugee programs, under the fair share law, it was reasonable to anticipate that our immigration of refugees would not materially escalate, but we had no reason to state with any assurance that X number of refugees was all that could come into the United States in any given year. But under this legislation, every Member of this Congress knows that the refugee flow into the United States is limited to the number of 10,200.

So it is fair to say that what we have before us is a suggestion, for our consideration, to make our immigration flow come from three specific areas; 170,000 external to the Western Hemisphere, 10,200 of that number being set aside for refugees; 120,000 ceiling on the immigration flow from the Western Hemisphere and in addition to that X number—we cannot be absolutely certain in this area as to the numbers that will come in—nonquota who are parents and spouses and children of intending immigrants.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment wholeheartedly the House conferees who brought back to the House this immigration legislation. This is far better legislation than the bill that passed the House several weeks ago. The conferees have done a fine job in finally working out adequate, comprehensive immigration legislation to replace inadequate, inequitable, antiquated legislation that badly needed change.

Particularly I want to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], who I believe is one of the most knowledgeable, if not the most knowledgeable, Members in the Congress on immigration matters. I know of his long and diligent investigation of and work on immigration problems. I think all of us on both sides of the aisle owe him a debt of gratitude for his superb work.

Although I have complimented all of the conferees, Republicans and Democrats alike, I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to say strong and emphatic words congratulating the other members of the conference committee on our side of the aisle: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the rank-

ing Republican member on the Committee on the Judiciary, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], a distinguished lawyer and expert on immigration legislation. But may I add words of congratulation to a person on the subcommittee that handled immigration who, unfortunately, for understandable reasons, was not a member of the conference committee. I speak now of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] who was the author of the important amendment placing a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This amendment, strongly opposed by the Johnson administration, barely defeated in the House, has now been incorporated in the final version of the legislation. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the able, constructive legislator, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR]. I believe his fight when the bill was before the House to impose a reasonable ceiling on Americans from the Western Hemisphere was significant in making the other body come to the realization that this was a sound proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by urging that all Members of the House vote for this conference report. It is good legislation. It is sound legislation. It is a great improvement over that legislation which we have had on the statute books, as amended, for a great many years.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate myself with the remarks, the commendation and the tribute of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] in his salute and his justifiable recognition of this outstanding West Virginian, and great American, Representative ARCH MOORE.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have been a member of this subcommittee for now almost 19 years. I have seen some good men come and some good men go during that time. But, believe me, sir, I have never seen a more dedicated, sincere, honest, intelligent, capable, hard working member than the gentleman now occupying the well of the House, Mr. MOORE.

He, together with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], chairman of our subcommittee, has done a magnificent job. Without this great team working and pulling together—we would not have an immigration bill. This was a non-partisan job. I would be derelict in my duty and to my colleagues and to the Nation if I did not say today that it has been a joy and a privilege and a pleasure yes, a real satisfaction to have been able to be associated on this fine committee and to work with you, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. FEIGHAN, on this committee over these past years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we, your managers on the part of this House, have come back to the House of Representatives today in a blaze of glory. The Mac-

Gregor amendment that was adopted here in the House by a teller vote of 196 to 194 has been restored, and what is more important—retained in the bill. It was because this most important amendment was later deleted that I voted against the bill. I had to leave my President, my Speaker, and both of my chairmen when I spoke up for this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a good bill, and I urge, and I beg, and I implore, and I plead with my colleagues to support it.

It is the best bill with which we could possibly come to the floor, and it is one that you can go home and defend. Mr. Speaker, all of the members of our subcommittee have done the Nation a great service by voting for and supporting this bill. Thank heaven that we have men of their vision, devotion to duty, and their character at the helm of our Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to ask a question relating to section 15 of the conference report which deals with mentally retarded children.

I have had two specific cases in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, where the rest of the family were admitted to the United States but a single retarded child at that time was barred—if my understanding is correct section 15 in this bill would now make it possible when a family is to be admitted to the United States for that mentally retarded child to come in with the rest of the members of the family; is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's interpretation of the legislation is correct. That child could enter with his parents.

Mr. BALDWIN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, that would be regardless of the age of the child?

Mr. MOORE. That is right. As the gentleman will recall, we in the House placed 14-year-olds as an age limitation on the entry, but the Senate removed the age limitation. Now it would apply without respect to age with reference to persons in the mental retardation area.

Mr. BALDWIN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, it would also apply even if the child is the only member of the family remaining in the foreign country—because of having been previously barred by the old Act—and he could now be brought in, even though the rest of his family is now here?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct. That child presently is excluded under our law by reason of his mental condition. What we have done here is this: That child will now be permitted to join his family that may be in residence here in the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia and wish to

congratulate the conferees for making this change in the law.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members of the House that some question was raised and discussion was had with respect to the problem of Cuban refugees. The Senate inserted a suggested status change for them or an opportunity to have status in such a way that your House conferees felt that this was neither the time nor the opportunity to discuss the same; that it is a matter which should be discussed by the Commission which has been created under this legislation and is directed to do so and that we should not give any consideration at this time to any of the problems of the situation with reference to the Cuban refugees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there are two points I want to make so that I feel the membership of the House may be fully informed as to what we are doing in this immigration field.

I want to reemphasize what we do here today in great measure strengthens our immigration laws as they are presently on the books.

We have for the first time very strict labor controls in this legislation, and I believe it will in great measure meet with the full and complete agreement of every Member of the House. What we did in this area was in the best interest of the country, and in the best interest of those who labor in this country for a living. In addition to that, I think everybody who goes home from this session of Congress is going to be criticized and be met with the suggestion that great numbers have again been added to those who can come into this country. I have looked very deeply into the statistical data available to us from the Department of State where they tried to anticipate what might happen after this law becomes operative on June 30, 1968. It is my best opinion, based upon their best estimate, there would not be any material change in the numbers that come into this country, and, as a matter of fact, it could conceivably happen there will be less immigration flowing from all areas of the world into this country after June 30, 1968, than we are presently experiencing.

Several gentlemen in the House who have served on the committee have been more than kind in their reference to my work in this area. I would be totally remiss, Mr. Speaker, today if I did not say to each Member of the Congress that the conferees did what I believe to be an outstanding job, and in the best interests of the country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] has always been at the forefront in this battle. I may say, however, that this House should understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has done a tremendous job in marshaling the committee together into many, many

executive sessions to consider this matter and, if I may say so, he has done this for the sole purpose of bringing about remedial legislation in the field of immigration. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has done a tremendous job in this area, and I believe it merits the sincere support of all Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is truly and genuinely bipartisan. In all respects it serves the best national interest. Its bipartisanship is reflected in the unanimity by which its basic provisions passed the House Subcommittee on Immigration and the strong vote of confidence given to it by the full Judiciary Committee.

When this subcommittee bill was before the full committee not one single syllable was changed, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who graciously accepted the new immigration bill.

The Senate abandoned consideration of any pending Senate bill and considered solely and adopted the House subcommittee bill with only one major change, namely, placing a ceiling of 120,000 on immigration from independent republics of the Western Hemisphere. It added also other minor provisions which were resolved in conference.

The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] has stated that the conference changed the composition of the select Commission to study immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Under this conference report, the Commission will consist of five Members of the House, five Members of the Senate, and five members appointed by the President. This change clearly recognizes the primary duty and responsibility of the Congress to regulate immigration into the United States. That congressional responsibility has been affirmed by the Supreme Court in the interstate and foreign commerce decision and which has been reaffirmed many times since. I want to commend the Senate conferees for their acceptance of this change which removes any doubts that responsibility for regulating immigration into the United States rests with the Congress. That fact is restated in the conference report. The responsibility remains in the Congress where it properly belongs.

I would like to pay tribute also to the Members of the House subcommittee for the arduous work they have performed. I would just like to read a pertinent sentence from the Senate report:

We owe a great debt to the House Immigration Subcommittee and its staff for the creation of this system.

I pay special tribute to the very able and distinguished ranking Republican Member of the House subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for the steady and sturdy role that he played in the long and hard

struggle to produce this immigration bill. The distinguished Member from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] gave our work the full benefit of his wisdom gained by 18 years experience as a member of our subcommittee. It has been my pleasure to sit next to him in committee meetings for all those years and I take this opportunity to thank him for his great service in guiding some of our most difficult deliberations to a happy conclusion. I feel the House can take justifiable pride in this bill because its genesis was in the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. One can support this bill on the basis of sound logic and reason, devoid of any emotion.

I urge all Members to support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, today share the observations and the pride of the chairman of the full committee concerning the contributions that have been made by all immigrants to the greatness of our country, and certainly share the views concerning the importance and acceptability of this conference report as outlined by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

As has been frequently suggested, during this session, the minority party is rarely given the credit it deserves. But I would say without any hesitation that the immigration bill, and the conference report on that subject, is in a large measure due to the great contribution that was made by the minority party, and particularly the leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the logic which was expressed and argued persuasively by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

I point out that the sole purpose—or certainly the principal purpose of the bill—was to eliminate discrimination as it had long existed by reason of the national origins quota system. I remember the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], pointing out on the floor of the House that if we were going to eliminate discrimination, we ought to do it completely. It seems to me that it was his logic and his persuasiveness that compelled the Senate and all of the conferees, on both sides of the aisle, to accept in this conference report a ceiling of 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

But I would also add, especially to my friend from New York, who had some questions concerning the validity of this provision, that again, due to the wisdom of the conferees, I believe, if there is any doubt or any problem or any interference with the national policy of our country, it is safeguarded in this conference report by the presence of the committee controlled by the Congress of the United States, but having five public members appointed by the President. So that if there is any mistake discovered during the next 3 years, it can be brought to the attention of the Congress, and if there is any omission or correction that is needed, we can make it.

So I believe the conference report is one that can be voted on favorably by every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle. I enthusiastically support it and urge its adoption. It represents a necessary and important change in the new law regulating immigration.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] 2 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I address the House as a former member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. I speak as one who has acquired perhaps a hard-nosed reputation on the subject of immigration. But I speak as one who has followed the course of the immigration bill in most careful detail from its inception several years ago when the late distinguished Member from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Tad Walter, began the first hearings which gave genesis to this legislation.

I can say without equivocation that the conference report as presently constructed represents an improvement over both the House bill and the bill passed by the other body. As such, I will vote for the conference report. I shall do so enthusiastically. It will strengthen the present law in several material particulars.

I would not want the opportunity to pass without echoing the tributes which have been paid to those on the subcommittee responsible for this legislation.

I have particular reference to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]; to the ranking minority members of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]; and to the able gentleman from Minnesota, who made such a major contribution to the final form of this bill [Mr. MACGREGOR].

During the course of the debate in the House I was one of those who attempted to persuade the House to adopt the MacGregor amendment. The House by a narrow vote rejected the MacGregor amendment, and I am glad to see that the other body has corrected this error and taken a step which I believe should be taken at this time, a step which I predict will not have the adverse effects which have been claimed for it but rather will have beneficial consequences in both domestic affairs and foreign affairs.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, this conference report should be supported by every Member of the House of Representatives. The final bill as worked out by the House and Senate conferees makes historic progress in emphasizing America's desire to reunite families. Its provisions strengthen national security and protect each American worker.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will completely sweep away discrimination on account of race, national origin, and geographic location of birth in our immigration laws.

Let me address myself to the concern expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and the gentleman from

New York [Mr. GILBERT]. Mr. GONZALEZ expressed his reservation about a ceiling of 120,000 annually on Western Hemisphere immigration, a ceiling which will exclude immediate family members. Mr. GILBERT expressed his concern about the reaction of our friends south of the Rio Grande and in the Caribbean to this new development in our immigration policy.

Let me point out to these gentlemen and to all Members of the House that this conference report treats immigrants from the Western Hemisphere more favorably than immigrants from anywhere else in the world in three respects: First, by giving 120,000 numbers to the Western Hemisphere favoritism is shown in relationship to the 170,000 numbers given to the rest of the world; second, no country of the Western Hemisphere will be subject to the 20,000 per country limit that will apply to our historic friends and allies across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and, third, the requirements of the preference system will not apply to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In view of these facts it is important to point out that the acceptance of the worldwide ceiling concept, with the inclusion of immigrants from all countries under a numerical limitation, is not a new idea nor is it original with me. Ten years ago, in February of 1955, a group of Congressmen and Senators, whom I am sure most of us would agree were outstanding men despite disagreement with their political philosophies, offered a comprehensive immigration bill. Members will find in the RECORD of February 25, 1955, an address by the then Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, describing that bill. It was cosponsored by Senator Lehman and by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House [Mr. CELLER].

That bill would have established a worldwide ceiling of 250,000 annually. It would have extended the ceiling to all immigration from the Western Hemisphere, from whence immigrants would have been treated on exactly the same basis as immigrants from across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Senator Lehman included this analysis of the 1955 Celler-Lehman bill:

A major feature of the proposed act is its consolidation, within the quota, of all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This has been done in order to put all foreign countries on the same basis consistent with the best interests and needs of the United States. Thus the proposed act does not give non-quota status, as present law does, to aliens born in the Western Hemisphere, with the right to immigrate to the United States without limitation as to number.

In addition—and this is a vital feature—a nonquota status is given to parents as well as to children and spouses of American citizens (sec. 102(a)(19)(A)).

At the same time that nonquota status is given to parents of American citizens, the proposed act deprives aliens born in the Western Hemisphere of their nonquota status, as already described.

The effect of these changes is to confine the nonquota status to very special classes of immigrants—children, spouses, and parents of citizens, professors, ministers, and one or two other technical categories—and to place all general immigration, including immigra-

tion from the Western Hemisphere, under the quota system.

The bill we are considering today treats prospective immigrants from the Western Hemisphere more favorably than they would have been treated under the bill cosponsored by Senator Lehman and Congressman CELLER.

May I add for the RECORD the names of these additional cosponsors of this legislation in 1955: The now Vice President of the United States, HUBERT HUMPHREY; the deceased Senator Kefauver of Tennessee; the deceased former President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; Senators Chavez, MAGNUSON, McNAMARA, PASTORE, and as cosponsors in the House with our distinguished Judiciary Committee chairman, Mr. CELLER, was the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. YATES, Mr. POWELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. ASHLEY, and Mr. REUSS, among others.

This comprehensive bill introduced by these gentlemen 10 years ago would have been more restrictive on Western Hemisphere immigration than the bill we are about to adopt by what I hope will be a virtually unanimous vote in this Chamber today.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Is it the gentleman's contention that adopting a ceiling for the Western Hemisphere nations is not an unprecedented action?

Mr. MACGREGOR. To my knowledge, establishing this very generous ceiling which gives favored treatment to the Western Hemisphere is a new step in immigration laws and a step first proposed, according to my research, by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and by Senator Lehman 10½ years ago.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Then it is a new and novel inclusion in our immigration legislation?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No, not at all. The idea has been pending in various legislative proposals for many years.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Not the idea. I am asking specifically if the gentleman holds to the thought that this is not an unprecedented action with reference to the Western Hemisphere nations with respect to our immigration laws.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say it is a very wise and thoughtful step which we are taking perhaps 10½ years too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the gentleman from Texas and to all others in the House that if the ideas of the gentlemen whose names I have listed had any validity 10 years ago, then this conference report today should be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished member of the Subcommittee

on Immigration, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman is so eminently correct when he says that our neighbors to the south of the border, our Latin American friends—all in the Western Hemisphere have been really treated decently. This is so because while there is a ceiling of 170,000 for the entire world we have set an additional ceiling of 120,000 especially for our neighbors and friends in this hemisphere. This is concrete, ample proof to them that we are giving them approximately 40 percent of the total ceiling allowed throughout the length and breadth of the world.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for emphasizing once again that we are giving favored treatment to our friends south of the Rio Grande in adopting this conference report today.

Mr. CHELF. If a 40-percent ratio is bad treatment, I want you to give me that kind for the rest of my natural life. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me salute the gentleman, Mr. MACGREGOR for offering his amendment. It is a wise and a just one. Now please let me thank publicly my two chairmen—Mr. CELLER and Mr. FEIGHAN. Along with the entire subcommittee they are especially deserving of credit. Why that good chairman of ours, Mr. FEIGHAN, almost worked the hides off of us on the subcommittee. He kept calling meetings day after day—week after week until we had gotten the job done. He is justly entitled to all of the praise that one can heap upon him. His leadership was inspiring to all of us—his tenacity to purpose helped to beat the adjournment deadline.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say to the House that the conference committee was in session for more than 4 hours on the differences between the House and the other body. In all my experience in the Congress I enjoyed nothing more than the harmonious, constructive working session of the committee.

I join in what has been said about all of my colleagues who were members of the committee, and I want to refer, again, to that able, gentlemanly, kindly chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and to my good friend ARCH MOORE, top Republican member of the subcommittee, who carried the burden so effectively for so long. That so many Members of the House voted for the legislation when it was first before the House, and who will soon vote to accept the report, is a fine tribute to ARCH MOORE; to MIKE FEIGHAN, whom I have known so long and so favorably. You know, Mr. Speaker, MIKE FEIGHAN was the minority leader of the Ohio House of Representatives more years ago than either of us like to admit, when I was speaker of the Ohio house. It has been a happy occasion for me to work with him on many important matters, including the matter before us today. I commend the conference committee report to every Member of the House. I am of the firm opinion that it would serve a useful public purpose if it were overwhelmingly accepted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support to the adoption of the conference report on the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, H.R. 2580.

In this behalf, I take occasion to compliment the members of the conference committee and particularly my colleagues from this body. In my opinion, the House conferees have resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation in a manner consistent with the views of the vast majority of the Members of this body and that great majority of Americans throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay particular tribute to the contributions made by the Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee in carrying forward views consistent with our Republican platform and principles. My colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], has performed a stellar job in this connection. In addition, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], by persisting in behalf of a numerical ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration, has helped produce a result which is equitable for the people of all of the friendly nations throughout the world. I am thinking primarily of our friends across the Atlantic with whom we have so much in common and whose citizens by emigrating to these shores in the past have contributed so substantially to our culture, our economy, and our political system.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report results in producing an immigration bill which should contribute to our country's improved foreign relations and to an orderly immigration system consistent with the natural growth and development of our society.

I am particularly happy that this legislation will enable the families of American citizens to be reunited more rapidly and that we will have the benefit of those skilled and professional individuals who prefer our system of government and who desire the opportunities which are afforded in our land.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body may take justifiable pride in this achievement of the 89th Congress and I am personally proud to have made a small contribution to the final result.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Act now before the Congress represents a welcome change in U.S. immigration policy by removing the obnoxious and discriminatory system of national quotas. I will vote for the bill.

This bill, however, does in my opinion include one serious error of judgment. By imposing a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere it threatens to end the historic free flow of immigrants across the U.S. boundaries with Canada and Mexico.

When the bill was first before the House, I joined with my colleagues to defeat a proposed amendment to place a limit on immigration into the United States from the Western Hemisphere. I did so for two reasons: First, representa-

tives of the administration had led many of us to believe that in their judgment imposition of such a limitation at this time would seriously impair U.S. relations with Latin America; and second, I was concerned that such a limitation might seriously reduce the free flow of emigration to this country from Canada and Mexico.

In the Senate an annual limitation of 120,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere was placed in the bill after assurances from the President that he did not oppose the provision. Those assurances help to satisfy my first area of concern over this provision.

Nonetheless I remain disturbed by the possibility that the annual limitation on Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States may affect our relations with our only contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. During fiscal year 1964, 139,284 persons, including spouses and children, emigrated from Western Hemisphere countries to the United States. Over half of these came from our immediate neighbors—38,074 from Canada and 32,967 from Mexico.

If the rate of Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States remains at this level, or as is more likely increases, and if the bill is administered on a first-come-first-serve basis, there is no assurance whatsoever that Canada and Mexico emigration to the United States will not be affected.

I am sympathetic to the proposition that if regional immigration quotas are assigned to the rest of the world, they should also be assigned to the Western Hemisphere, for there is no inherent difference between these nations and others. There is, however, one vital distinction between Canada and Mexico and all the other nations of the world. They are the only two countries which border directly on the United States—and in my opinion fully free and unlimited immigration between the United States and its immediate neighbors should be maintained.

Nine of my colleagues joined me in a statement on United States-Canadian relations last Monday which proposed that United States-Canadian immigration remain unlimited, except for the reasonable qualifications of financial responsibility and good moral character.

Mr. Speaker, because this is a bill from conference, and the House does not have the option of amending it, and because in balance it is a progressive step in U.S. immigration policy, I shall vote for the bill. But I hope that the Select Commission on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, which this bill establishes, will give every serious consideration to recommendations to leave Canadian and Mexican emigration to the United States unlimited. The Select Commission must report to the Congress with its recommendations fully 6 months before the limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration is scheduled to become effective in June of 1968. I have every confidence that the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in making their appointments to the Select Commission will assure consideration of U.S. immigration

policy toward Canada and Mexico, and that thereby we can rectify the shortcomings of this bill so as to preserve the closest and the most productive relations possible with our Canadian and Mexican neighbors.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the conference report on the immigration bill which is now under consideration by the House.

I think this bill is long overdue. Over a long period of time now, I have been filing and pressing a major immigration bill designed to remedy some of the problems that this bill deals with.

It is a bill which would allocate and transfer some unused quota numbers from some nations to other nations having oversubscribed quotas. It had the support of three Presidents and many groups and people.

My bill was designed, just as the current bill is, to reunite families and expedite the admission to the United States of the loved ones of American citizens who have served this Nation faithfully and well, established themselves here and brought up their children here, and who have as good loyal citizens contributed greatly, in war and peace, to the security, well-being and prosperity of our nation.

Naturally I am gratified that the principles of immigration law which I have striven for so long in this body have finally been written into this great human charter of immigration which we are considering today.

It was back in April 1953 that I first sponsored legislation to redistribute unused immigration quotas, which averaged about 60,000 yearly then. I did this in an effort to help correct the inequities in the immigration laws which discriminated against such countries as Italy and Greece in the allocation of immigration quotas.

I was prompted then, as I am now in my support of the bill now before the House, to help unite families here with their loved ones remaining overseas. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now more than ever, that liberalization of the immigration laws is a matter of simple justice and I am glad that this House is finally acting to revise the national origins clause so as to help thousands of worthy American citizens with close relatives caught in the web of discriminatory quotas who have been waiting for many years for the chance to come to this country.

As is the case in the bill now before the House, my bill was drafted in such a way that no increase in the overall quota totals is required. My bill merely redistributes the unused quotas with the added provision that those countries benefiting from the unused quota system would repay, whenever necessary, over a 5-year period, the countries from which additional quota numbers have been received. This would help such nations as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Armenia, Albania, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain whenever freedom is restored to these unhappy lands.

However, I want to make it clear that I oppose the concessions made in the conference to the other body by writing

into this bill a ceiling on immigration for our neighbors of the American hemisphere. To my mind, this is a step backward, and I am fearful that it will cause a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of our neighbors.

It is true that these neighbors will still receive 40 percent of the total quotas provided by the bill, but nevertheless, for the first time in history quota restrictions are imposed upon them, and I think this is most unfortunate and most unwise.

How the formula designed to admit people on the basis of their skills, talent, ability, and so forth, will work out is problematical, and depends upon the way the law is administered.

While scholarship, talents, and ability always have their place and contribute much, we should not overlook the fact that, as our own national experience so clearly reveals, it is from the lowly, from the humble, from the unschooled and untutored, and often from those who for long have been denied opportunities, that much of the great leadership and most loyal followership of this Nation has emerged.

This Nation needs hewers of wood and drawers of water who can furnish the sinews for our economy and for our way of life and for the development of our family structure, from which so many leaders have sprung, and so many strong, loyal people have come to defend the country in time of need, to operate its factories, its transportation systems, its farms and do the work that has to be done in any great economic system like ours.

I hope and urge that the administrators of the immigration bill will have this factor in mind and will not close the doors to the worthy, the industrious, to the honest, eager, if ordinary, citizens who want to come to this country as many of our forebears did, to seek the opportunities of its freedom and by their devotion, loyalty, and labor lift themselves up and lift their families up to strengthen the fiber and the leadership of the country.

There is a great place for the geniuses, the supertalented, and the well to do. But they alone will not suffice. We must also, to the extent we can, be a haven for the worthy poor, the unprivileged, the disadvantaged, those of the strength, will, and determination to make their way, those willing to work their way up, those who will be loyal to American institutions, a credit and asset to the Nation.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think the committee, on the whole, has done well in formulating and presenting this bill and I think it will be helpful to our foreign relations and hope it will be helpful in other ways as well: to our friends and neighbors who can be reunited with their dear ones, to our economy to meet some of its needs, and to our great Government and our local communities to whom fresh, young vigorous blood may, as in the past, bring new strength, new ideas of shaping our free institutions along sound free, constructive lines, designed to cope with and conquer the problems of the space age.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein as part of my remarks a very fine letter from the highly dedicated, able, and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which heard and reported this legislation, my beloved and esteemed friend, Chairman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, which makes it clear that the new immigration bill as amended by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], provides for the redistribution of the unused quota numbers and thereafter eliminates the national origin quota system and repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, all of which were primary objectives of my original bill. It has been a long struggle to enact this bill and I trust it will prove worthy of our confidence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1965.
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of July 15, concerning H.R. 2078 to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes. Your bill would provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers over 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1971.

The new immigration bill, as amended by my subcommittee and approved by the full Committee on the Judiciary provides for the redistribution of the unused quota numbers during the next 3 fiscal years and thereafter eliminates the national origins quota system. In addition, your bill repeals section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is also repealed by H.R. 2580 as amended.

I am enclosing a copy of the report on that legislation.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2580) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to reject the Senate amendment placing a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere in the amount of 120,000 persons per annum.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question whether the gentleman's motion is in order. The gentleman from New York moved the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the previous question is ordered a motion to recommit is in order if the gentleman is opposed to the conference report, and no Member on the minority side seeks to offer such a motion. The gentleman is recognized on his motion.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 69, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—320

Adair	Delaney	Hutchinson
Adams	Dent	Ichord
Addabbo	Denton	Irwin
Albert	Derwinski	Jacobs
Anderson,	Devine	Jarman
Tenn.	Dickinson	Jennings
Andrews,	Dingell	Joelson
N. Dak.	Dole	Johnson, Calif.
Annunzio	Donohue	Johnson, Pa.
Arends	Dulski	Jones
Ashbrook	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Ashley	Dyal	Karsten
Ayres	Edmondson	Karth
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Kastenmeier
Bandstra	Erlenborn	Kee
Barrett	Evans, Colo.	Keith
Bates	Evins, Tenn.	Kelly
Battin	Fallon	Keogh
Belcher	Farbstein	King, Calif.
Bell	Farnley	King, N.Y.
Bennett	Farnum	King, Utah
Berry	Fasell	Kirwan
Betts	Feighan	Kluczyński
Bingham	Findley	Kornegay
Blatnik	Fino	Krebs
Boggs	Flood	Kunkel
Boland	Foley	Laird
Bolling	Ford, Gerald R.	Langen
Bow	Ford,	Latta
Brademas	William D.	Leggett
Bray	Fraser	Lipscomb
Brock	Friedel	Long, Md.
Brooks	Fulton, Pa.	Love
Broomfield	Fulton, Tenn.	McCarthy
Brown, Calif.	Gallagher	McClary
Broyhill, N.C.	Garmatz	McCulloch
Broyhill, Va.	Gialmo	McDade
Burke	Gibbons	McDowell
Burton, Calif.	Gilbert	McEwen
Byrne, Pa.	Gilligan	McFall
Byrnes, Wis.	Grabowski	McGrath
Cabell	Gray	McVicker
Cahill	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Callan	Green, Pa.	MacGregor
Callaway	Greigg	Machen
Cameron	Grider	Mackay
Carey	Griffin	Mackie
Casey	Griffiths	Madden
Cederberg	Grover	Mailhard
Celler	Gubser	Martin, Mass.
Chamberlain	Gurney	Martin, Nebr.
Chelf	Hagen, Calif.	Mathias
Clancy	Hall	Matsunaga
Clark	Halleck	May
Clausen,	Halpern	Meeds
Don H.	Hamilton	Miller
Clawson, Del.	Hanley	Minish
Cleveland	Hanna	Mink
Clevenger	Hansen, Idaho	Minshall
Cohelan	Hansen, Wash.	Moeller
Collier	Harris	Monagan
Conable	Harsha	Moore
Conte	Harvey, Ind.	Moorhead
Conyers	Harvey, Mich.	Morgan
Corbett	Hathaway	Morrison
Corman	Hawkins	Morse
Craley	Hays	Morton
Cramer	Hechler	Mosher
Culver	Helstoski	Moss
Cunningham	Hicks	Multer
Curtin	Holland	Murphy, Ill.
Curtis	Horton	Murray
Dague	Howard	Nedzi
Daniels	Hungate	Nelsen
Davis, Wis.	Huot	O'Brien

O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quile
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Relfel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.

Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebell
Schweiker
Sennet
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton

Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
Widnall
Willson
Charles H.
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Yates
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—69

Abbott
Abernethy
Andrews,
Glenn
Ashmore
Baring
Beckworth
Bonner
Buchanan
Burleson
Cooley
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Everett
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys

Gonzalez
Gross
Haley
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hull
Jones, Mo.
Landrum
Lennon
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Mills
Natcher
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Purcell
Quillen
Randall

Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Satterfield
Secrest
Selden
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Young

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
George W.
Aspinall
Bolton
Burton, Utah
Carter
Colmer
Daddario
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Calif.

Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Goodell
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Holifield
Hosmer
Johnson, Okla.
Lindsay
Long, La.
Michel
Mize
Morris
Murphy, N.Y.

O'Hara, Ill.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roncallo
Roybal
St Germain
Scott
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.
Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Hardy against.
Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Morris against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roncallo with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Aspinall with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Edwards with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY COMPARABILITY ACT

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10281, with Mr. DENT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281. This is an excellent bill that has been carefully thought out and developed through extensive hearings and executive consideration in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was reported from our committee by a vote of 20 to 3.

Although I personally feel that increases substantially higher than the 4½-percent initial increase in the bill are fully justified by the record, the bill represents the best measure that could be worked out under the circumstances. I do want to commend the very fine diligence and spirit of cooperation in which all members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee worked together to bring out a bill that can become law this year.

Mr. Chairman, one of the wisest and most foresighted policies ever adopted by the Congress is the principle of compara-

bility between Federal and private enterprise salaries that was written into the statutes by Public Law 87-793. I fully subscribed to that principle, and to the many affirmations by the Congress and by the President that it must be implemented in order to serve the best interests of the Government and its employees.

While the 4½-percent general salary increase scheduled for October 1, 1965, under this bill will not achieve full comparability, it certainly is a step in the right direction. Present Federal salary rates are roughly comparable with those in private enterprise during the February-March period of 1964, so far as concerns the lower pay grades and levels. In the middle and upper grades and levels they compare with private enterprise rates in 1963 and 1962, respectively. Private enterprise levels rose approximately 3 percent more from February and March of 1964 to the same months in 1965. Therefore, at this particular time the lower salary grades and levels in the Government, as now in effect, lag at least 7 or more percent behind comparability with private enterprise levels which they are supposed to match according to Public Law 87-793.

I submit that it would be not only an injustice to the employees—a breach of trust—but also a contradiction of a firm policy adopted by the Congress were this legislation not to include at least the 4½-percent increase.

Aside from the matter of the general salary increases, perhaps the most important part of this bill is section 107, dealing with overtime and holiday pay for postal employees. Section 107 will revamp and modernize the outmoded and unfair treatment of overtime and holiday work that has been in effect, regrettably, for many years.

Many thousands of postal substitutes are called on officially to work heavy overtime schedules—often as much as 60 or 70 or 80 hours a week—at straight time pay. The record shows that literally millions of hours of this kind of overtime is worked each year. It is a shocking thing when we consider that the Federal Government—which should be the leader in enlightened pay policies—has permitted this situation to exist. It is almost unheard of for employees in private industry to work more than 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week or on Sundays without being paid at least time and one-half.

This sorry condition will be remedied by section 107 of our committee bill. All postal field service employees—including substitutes—will be guaranteed time and one-half pay for work officially ordered in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. Regular employees will have Monday through Friday workweeks, with authority in the Postmaster General to schedule different workweeks when necessary to provide service, and any work they are called on to perform on Sundays will be overtime, for which they will be paid time and one-half.

This section also updates and clarifies holiday pay provisions for postal employees. Any employee officially ordered to work on one of the eight legal holi-

days will receive an extra day's pay—that is, double time—except that for work on Christmas Day a further half day's pay will be added, equaling double time and a half.

I should also like to invite the special attention of my colleagues to section 116 of the bill, on page 32. The effect is to increase from \$100 per year to \$150 per year the maximum authorized allowance to employees who are required to wear uniforms in the performance of their duties. The \$100 limit was enacted 11 years ago and I do not think there is any question but that costs of wearing apparel have skyrocketed, along with other living costs, in the meantime. I am confident that my colleagues—and, indeed, the general public—take pride in the clean-cut and well-turned-out appearance that is so typical of our postal letter carriers. This provision of H.R. 10281 is urgently needed to give these fine employees, and others who must wear uniforms, adequate provision for keeping their uniforms up to the fine high standards that are traditional with postal employees.

The bill extends the general salary increase to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949; all postal field service employees; medical and nursing personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; foreign service officers and employees; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees; congressional employees; judicial employees; and employees whose salaries are fixed by administrative action. These are the groups customarily and historically covered by general Federal salary legislation.

The bill also embodies the excellent administration recommendation for severance pay for employees involuntarily separated through no fault of their own. This consists of two elements. There will be a basic severance allowance of 1 week's pay for each year of service up to 10 and 2 weeks' pay for each year of service beyond 10. To this will be added a further "age adjustment" allowance of 10 percent of the total basic allowance for each year the employee was over 40 years of age when separated.

Mr. Chairman, this is an eminently fair, moderate, and reasonable bill and I urge all Members to vote for it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us today is simple and clear. It is whether or not we shall continue to maintain a double standard in our outlook toward those who are employed by the Federal Government in this country and those who are employed in private enterprise. I understand that the President of the United States does not approve this bill. Yet on May 12, 1965, as quoted in the report he said:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, we do now have a double standard. Our Federal employees, while they have received generous raises in recent years are still well behind on average those employed by private industry. Nor is this all. While we require of private enterprise that there be no more than a 40-hour workweek for employees and that time and a half be paid for overtime work, we in Federal Government, and particularly in the Postal Service, work men 60 hours and more on straight time, and therefore, do not require of ourselves what we demand of others.

We are called upon today to match words with action, to enact into law provisions which will simply put on an equitable and equal footing those who are in the Federal employ. I, for one, believe in economy, but I believe it is false economy to give the laborer less than his hire. We seek to keep those who are employed in Federal Government on an equal footing, and not on a lesser footing economically, with those in private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, members of this committee disagree on certain features of this bill. For example, I join with the others who feel that the congressional pay raise feature should be removed from this bill. But I believe that H.R. 10281 is a step toward living up to the words which the President spoke on May 12, 1965, and translating those words into action. And more important than this, to many of us, it is a step toward keeping faith with the solemn commitments Congress itself has made to honor the principle of comparability. By its enactment we are simply doing right to the people to whom we have a specific and a very special responsibility and being right-minded and fairminded employers of those who are working in Government service.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the 1965 Federal Salary Adjustment Act. In the cloakroom and in the corridors in the last few days I have had many colleagues ask me different questions: Just what is in this complicated 38-page bill? Why are we having another pay bill this year—we just had one last year? Is not this a bigger bill than the administration recommended? Why have you brought in such a bill? What is this business about a congressional pay raise tucked away somewhere in this bill? And why do we have a second phase 1966 pay raise for Federal employees in this bill?

All of these questions will be answered during the debate. I will start out by saying that this is a good bill. It is the product of extensive and careful hearings. It was supported in committee by a margin of 20 to 3 and such distinguished gentlemen as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. BUCHANAN, who just spoke, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. OLSEN of Montana, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and others of the colleagues whom you respect, carefully considered all of the features of this legislation and agreed to support either in

whole or in large part—some of them with a few reservations—the features of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me take just a moment or two to tell you what is in the bill. This bill has a 1965 pay raise effective October 1 of 4.5 percent across the board for all of the 1.7 million Federal employees in the major salary systems, and this includes legislative employees.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer an amendment when we reach that stage of the consideration of the bill to reduce this across-the-board raise for this year from 4½ to 4 percent.

Mr. Chairman, there is a 1966 raise, October 1, 1966, provided for in the bill. This would be based upon a two-part formula. The formula would be the cost-of-living adjustment computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the basis of comparability with private enterprise for 1 year.

In addition, at each level there would be one-half the amount by which Federal pay now lags behind comparable civilian pay.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of fringe benefits for the Classification Act people. They now receive no overtime for 40 hours of work. We would add to this overtime for more than 8 hours in a day. We have a provision to discourage departments from requiring classified employees to travel on their offday hours.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some very serious abuses where classified employees are required to travel on Saturdays and Sundays and for which they receive no pay.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of important fringe benefits proposed in the bill for postal workers.

We have done away with some archaic and in some cases really outrageous features of the present postal law. There are Fair Labor Standards provisions now whereby a private employer cannot work people more than 40 hours a week without paying them overtime. If he fails, he can go to jail. Yet we had testimony that some postal workers were being worked as much as 60, 70, and 80 hours a week. Under the present law certain of these employees are paid no overtime. So, we take care of this and we bring Federal overtime standards up to those of enlightened private industry.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. UDALL. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana when I finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, we make certain seniority adjustments. It is now possible for an employee with 15 years of service to be making less money than another employee in the same post office with 12 years' service. We have made some very necessary adjustments here.

We have also provided for relocation expenses and for the first time for the many postal employees who are seriously affected by conversion to this new ZIP code and sectional center system which the post office is now trying to establish. These people will receive the kind of pay

that private enterprise gives to its employees when they have to rip up their families, sell their homes, and move to a new location.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this approach to be very sound and this part of the legislation was developed by the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], a very able member of the committee.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. As a matter of fact there are agencies in the Government that are provided with the authority to buy the home of the worker who is transferred, if he cannot otherwise sell it?

Mr. UDALL. Yes. This is not provided in this bill, however.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And if the gentleman will yield further, it is not provided for in this bill but as I say, there are even greater benefits which are provided by some agencies?

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And, especially, in private enterprise.

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. But we have not gone that far in this bill. We have not attempted to do that.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is correct. The administration came forward, and I commend it, and suggested that a new provision be added to the law that will be of great interest to many Members.

Mr. Chairman, private enterprise has for a long time had a system of severance pay. Under this feature of this bill, if a base is closed or if a Federal installation is closed, and comparable jobs are not found for the employees in other areas of the Federal service, the employee whose Federal service is terminated will receive a severance allowance. That allowance is composed of 1 week's pay for each year of basic service, up to 10 years, 2 weeks' pay for every year of service above 10 years. In addition, there is an age adjustment allowance so that an older worker who has extended service with the Federal Government will receive additional benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this we believe represents a very enlightened and sound proposal.

Another feature of the bill will give all Federal employees who are required to wear uniforms an increase in uniform allowance.

Mr. Chairman, 11 years ago the Congress authorized the sum of \$100 a year—up to that amount—for uniform allowance. This has been unchanged during this period of time. However, the cost of uniforms has gone up. In the bill we have a provision which would increase this allowance from \$100 to \$150.

We also, Mr. Chairman, have made another change in the bill.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And in that event with reference to the payment for

uniforms, the employee must submit vouchers to the effect that he did expand for uniforms a given amount of money in order to be reimbursed?

Mr. UDALL. Oh, yes. He is not handed the \$100. He simply comes in with the vouchers to show that he bought a jacket or a pair of pants or whatever is required and then he is reimbursed.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. If the gentleman will yield further, with reference to the letter carriers in the northern climes where he has to expand greater sums than those employed in summer temperate areas, he will probably be reimbursed far less than the cost of his uniforms?

Mr. UDALL. This is true. This gives the system some flexibility. For instance, our carriers in Tucson, Ariz., do not use many snowshoes or heavy boots. But I am sure that those carriers employed in the congressional district which gentleman from Montana represents do, this represents an important item. As a result of this provision the Department will have a little more flexibility.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And so it is an attempt by the committee to bring some greater justice in looking after these employees who are required to wear uniforms?

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, these are the main features of the bill. Because of the publicity we have had and the charges that will be made by some of our friends that we have gone far beyond what the administration desires in the field of pay this year, we propose to make certain changes.

Let me say that the Federal Government is the biggest employer in the world. We have five times as many civilian employees as General Motors. We find ourselves in this great committee caught between a number of difficult, conflicting interests that we are trying to respect and protect.

First, the Federal employees feel they are entitled to a fair, a decent, and comparable wage; second, the Government administrators who handle this great Government of ours are entitled to salary levels that will attract and keep good people who are responsible for providing national defense, postal service, and other things involved.

Third, we have an obligation to the taxpayers that they not be unfairly burdened with the cost of salaries that are unnecessary, that are too high.

So all of these pressing, three-way considerations, are in front of us. I know that the fixing of salaries in industry is an important and pressing problem where interest of stockholders, the employees, and the public must be balanced.

Your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has this very heavy obligation of fixing salaries which balance these three competing interests. We think we have done a good job. The four salary systems that we are confronted with now call for an expenditure of about \$13.4 billion every year for salaries of Federal employees. Admittedly, we are not paying enough, and the main

reason we have this bill here today, to answer the questions of some of my colleagues who have asked me "Why a pay bill this year?" the reason is Congress made a commitment in 1962. Previously we had haggles year in and year out, sometimes every year, sometimes not for several years, and we would argue about the cost of living, we would argue about what groups had pay raises in industry. We had a really disorderly system of fixing salaries. The administration came in in 1962 and said "Let us stop all of this, let us fix a standard for Federal pay." Congress fixed that standard, and that standard is that the Federal Government will pay on a comparable basis with what private industry pays.

The reason we are here today is that the Congress and the Federal Government have reneged on that pledge. The pledge was made in good faith, it was accepted by the employees. They have been patient. We have tried in our committee to work toward comparability. That is why we have the 1966 raise in the bill. We have committed ourselves. The administration, I am disappointed to say, this year said "we will have comparability, it is a great principle, and some day we will get to comparability, but not now."

The reason we have the 1966 phase in here is we are going to use the cost-of-living index to keep us from slipping back, and to make some effort to keep this pledge that we made in 1962. Despite what you may hear today, or what you have read in the newspapers, if this bill is passed, and the 1965 increase goes into effect, and the 1966 increase goes into effect, there will not be even a single category of Federal employees who are comparable with the same work in private industry.

So this is the main reason why the passage of this bill is essential now—to keep the pledge we made and to honor the standard we agreed to honor on keeping Federal pay comparable.

I hear some Members behind the rail and some back in the cloakroom say, "You keep giving these postal workers a raise and they are overpaid—why can we not just forget this whole business?" I think Members who have served on our committee and who have listened to the testimony will have ready answers to that line of argument. Postal employees walk 10 miles a day and carry a 35-pound bag and have to memorize 900 pages of regulations and have to know 3,000 names and addresses. They have to be diplomats. They have to represent the FBI and the Fish and Game Service and other Federal agencies in getting information. They are honest, hardworking people.

Now the Bureau of Labor Statistics formerly made studies to determine what it takes for what they call a modest but adequate standard of living in U.S. major cities. I hope my friends will get these figures. Bringing these figures up to date to this year, the AFL-CIO found that if you have a family of four in major U.S. cities it requires \$6,400 to have a modest—and I am emphasizing modest because there are no luxuries in—

volved here—it takes \$6,400 to have a modest but adequate standard of living—\$6,400 is the national average. The high figure is \$6,900 in the city of Seattle and the low figure is \$5,600 in Houston.

The present pay for the typical postal worker in these major cities is not the \$6,900 that it takes in Seattle nor the \$6,400 which is the U.S. average nor the \$5,600 that is necessary in Houston—the average pay now is about \$5,400. Under the administration proposal which we rejected, those postal workers would have received an increase in their pay of \$5 for every pay period—in other words, every two weeks they would get \$5 in take-home pay.

In blunt terms—and I hope my big city friends from Cincinnati, Chicago, and the other large cities will listen to this—in blunt terms this means that we are now providing letter carriers with pay which is inadequate for a modest but decent standard of living in these major cities. This is why we have gone slightly beyond the administration's recommendations and why we propose in 1966, if the House will approve this bill, to have a second phase that includes some catch-up feature.

The majority of the committee will offer a 4-percent amendment as I have indicated, down from 4½ percent. We have a few technical and perfecting amendments. Beyond this, the majority of the committee is going to stand on the bill as written. I think with the cooperation of the Members, we can have a good and thorough debate here today and resolve the points at issue and dispose of the matter at a reasonable hour. For my part, speaking for the leaders of the committee, I think we will cooperate in this effort.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I appreciate the gentleman's very forceful remarks about this piece of legislation. The U.S. Government is the biggest employer in the world. It is equally true as you have said that the U.S. Government ought to pay decent and fair wages. But my problem is this. What may be a fair wage in one part of this country may not be, as you have pointed out, a fair wage in another part of the country. The 13th Congressional District of Illinois and the area around Chicago, as you mentioned in your remarks, is an area that has a very high cost of living.

There is no question, and I am deeply concerned about this, that the postal employees in our area do not make enough at the present time to have a reasonable standard of living. They just do not make enough money. The wages are inadequate. But to raise all postal employees wages to the level that would permit a fair standard of living for the people in my area would be wasteful and unreasonable with respect to areas of a lower cost of living. Conversely, to lower the postal employees wages all over the country to what is fair standard of living in some communities would be equally unfair.

What I am asking is this: Why has not your committee come before the Congress with a proposal that takes into account the clear, well known, and well publicized differences in the cost of living in the various portions of this country?

Mr. UDALL. When I first came to this committee, what the gentleman has stated was my first reaction. I thought it was foolish to have a national wage standard for Federal employees. But I discovered that when you get into the practical problems—and I shall not take the time to go into all of them now, but I should be glad to discuss them with the gentleman later—one finds that there are so many practical problems, that it is difficult. For example, who would fix the area? Would the cities be included? Would you include the suburbs? If you include the suburbs, how far out would you go? What would you do when 200 groups come in and say, "We are right across the street from the high-paid area. We are in the low-paid area. But we go to the same grocery store. You had better change the jurisdiction."

The practical problems of doing what is the commonsense thing, on the surface, are so great that I became convinced a long time ago that the wage board type of system which the gentleman is suggesting, with its dozens, if not hundreds, of different standards for Federal wages in different parts of the country, is not feasible. That is the answer.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. RUMSFELD. It strikes me that what I suggest would be feasible for this reason: Corporations across this country are working with sliding scales along the line I have been describing. I am not a member of the gentleman's committee, and therefore I would not pretend to have the knowledge that the gentleman has on this subject, but is it not correct that what I am suggesting is every bit as reasonable and easy to attain as trying to determine the question of comparability? As the gentleman discussed comparability, it struck me that this concept has exactly the same problems that you are alleging exist with respect to the approach that I have suggested.

Mr. UDALL. No. Comparability is computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in a scientific manner. We have had no arguments presented on that question. We have had no employee organization complain about BLS. They do not argue about the basic method. They argue about the lag in time that it takes to make the computations. There is no argument there.

We cannot possibly resolve this question in the debate today. If the gentleman wishes to draft a bill to do what he suggests ought to be done, I shall take a look at it. But I believe that when he makes the first 200 attempts to draft a reasonable bill, he will do what I did—throw in the towel.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does not the Government fix the salaries of Government blue-collar workers by region?

Mr. UDALL. Oh, yes. That is a different problem. There you have a different standard.

Mr. YOUNGER. It is a different problem because it is treated in that way. This problem could be treated in the same way. You cannot fix comparability in New York, Atlanta, Louisiana, or somewhere else. Comparability cannot be fixed in that way.

Mr. UDALL. I tell the gentleman that on the surface his argument is logical, and I accept it. Certainly, a postal clerk's pay in one of the small towns in my district is an adequate salary, where it might not be an adequate salary in Brooklyn, Chicago, or Seattle. But we cannot resolve that question today. The bill before us does not deal with this subject. If the gentleman has some constructive ideas, I suggest that he get them together and draft a bill, and we will take a look at it.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have had a bill in for 8 years and your committee would not even look at it.

Mr. UDALL. I will promise the gentleman that I will take a look at it. This is a matter of some interest and concern.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. A minute ago the gentleman made a statement about overtime. I believe he said that most of the overtime is being worked by substitute clerks in the small offices.

Mr. UDALL. Most of the overtime is worked by substitutes. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Has the gentleman received any complaints from the substitutes because they are being forced to work overtime?

Mr. UDALL. The organizations which represent—

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not speaking about the organizations which represent anyone. I am talking about individuals. Is the substitute not doing it because he desires to earn more money by working more hours?

Mr. UDALL. We have not had individuals before the committee. But I have dealt with men who have spent their lives in the postal service and who have come before our committee. I am satisfied that the provisions of this bill have the support of the vast majority of the substitute postal workers.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not believe the gentleman will get complaints from those substitutes. The people the gentleman has been talking about are probably union representatives of organized labor. Is that not a fact?

Mr. UDALL. These are employee organizations.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not wish to take up too much of the gentleman's time. In reading through the report, I have found many misstatements of fact. I want to find out who is responsible. I should like to ask the gentleman if the following is a correct statement: "for not a single Federal salary has yet been brought to even a close approximation

of full and current comparability with its opposite number in private enterprise."

Mr. UDALL. I tell the gentleman that I am the author of the bill before the House. I signed the committee report that the gentleman is reading from, and I stand by every word of it. The statement that the gentleman just read is true.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Only a minute ago the gentleman was saying that in some of the small towns the postal employee might be the best paid person, or among the best paid people, in the community. I would go further and would say that in almost every town of less than 5,000, unless some special situation exists, the postal employee is the best paid man in the community, based on his education, his ability, and the work he does. Would the gentleman contradict that statement?

Mr. UDALL. No; I would not contradict the gentleman's statement in some respects. I have said that comparability has a national salary line. We have attempted to cover that.

I have commented about the suggestions made, that we have regional or local salary fixing in the Federal Establishment. In my judgment, this is not a feasible and practical thing to do now. Perhaps we can work it out someday. If the gentleman will help, perhaps we can.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When the gentleman says "not a single Federal salary" I would say that is a misstatement of fact.

Mr. UDALL. The statement refers to the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made findings.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It does not say that. It says "not a single Federal salary." That is talking about one man, not a single one.

Mr. UDALL. The point the gentleman does not recognize is that when I refer to comparability I am referring to the statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the standard Federal salary lines of comparability are national lines.

I agree that in some areas comparability might be less or greater. Traditionally, for as long as I know of, the Congress has adopted a policy of national guidelines or national salary lines for Federal employees in the postal service. That is what I refer to when I say that not a single Federal employee is above the national standard of comparability.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I see here that the statement is made:

Nor is any consideration whatever given to following the common practice of private industry of paying premium rates for work done on a Saturday.

Should that not be said to refer to labor-dominated private industry? Certainly we would not say it is not a common practice for employees in private industry to work on Saturday for the same rates they get on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

Mr. UDALL. Of course the gentleman is correct, in saying that many, many do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would the gentleman say a majority do?

Mr. UDALL. I would say that the vast majority of large employers—and

we are a large employer—pay premium rates.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. As to union employers, I agree. There are more people who are nonunion than union. Therefore, I say this is another misstatement of fact in the report. I can go through it and point out many other things.

I believe this starts on a false premise. The further one goes from a false premise, the further one gets from the facts and the further one gets from what actually should be done.

Mr. UDALL. I am deeply disappointed. I had hoped and expected that the gentleman would support our bill, but I respect his right to differ with us on this occasion.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We are speaking of comparability for postal workers and Federal employees as a general U.S. national level. I believe the statement of the committee is correct, and I am glad the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is protecting and defending the statement. This bill will not bring up Federal and postal employees to the general national level of comparability. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. UDALL. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Second, we are all interested in having the U.S. Government career service be a real career service. I see nothing wrong with the U.S. Government career service being a good service. Rather, I compliment the committee and recommend we in Congress make the effort to reach the point where U.S. Government employees will be fully respected as members of a career service, such as exists in Britain. Government employment can and should be a fine service. I want Government service to be highly desirable, and I certainly want full comparability with similar jobs in private industry.

I disagree with the gentleman from Missouri on the use as examples of his specific instances he quotes, as they are not the general rule in the U.S. economy. I believe we in Congress have to set the adequate standards for the country on a national basis.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman. He has been a real friend and very diligent in support of our committee in meeting the needs of Federal employees. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, first of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. In all of the 9 years I have been on this committee, I have never known a man who understands the problems of the Federal employees and has done so much to meet those problems as the gentleman has in this particular bill. In years past I can recall some haphazard types of bills that

we have brought before the House. They have passed, but they had inequities in them. I can now say that this is the most worked over bill, the most perfected bill, I have seen in all of the years I have been on this committee. This is due to the work of the gentleman from Arizona, the author, and Mr. MORRISON, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. CORBETT, myself, I hope and many others. We are taking care of many inequities here that have existed and which have never before this time been met head on. So, Mr. Chairman, I say that this committee did work long and it worked hard to bring you this piece of legislation. Therefore I support this bill. It is a good bill. I do not know how it could be improved.

As has been stated, in one of our previous bills, we had a provision which called for comparability. That was in 1962, and it is now a matter of policy that Federal salaries should be comparable to private industry salaries. We have had some trouble implementing that policy, but in this bill with the increase this year and the automatic increase next year we feel we will narrow that gap or hopefully we can eliminate the gap between what Federal employees receive and what is received in private industry.

I might say for the first time we have gone into this very complex problem of overtime. This is really a major part of this bill. Overtime provisions are long overdue, and I certainly hope that this body will realize the inequities that have existed and will vote for this bill so as to eliminate those inequities.

Mr. Chairman, I might say frankly that there is somewhat of an embarrassing matter in this bill having to do with the salaries of Members of Congress. I will say that the gentleman from Arizona has championed the formula that is in this bill. It is about the only way that has ever been developed where we will not go through the old procedure of providing a salary increase for ourselves, which is an embarrassment. It does have some political implications, and I am sorry to say that if there is an amendment to strike it out, I will have to give in and vote for such an amendment. Other than that this is an excellent bill. I do believe that the second raise provided for next year, the automatic increase, is most important. There has been some opposition to this from the administration. I would say that unless we keep it in this bill, next year being an election year, we will be faced with a much more difficult situation in this regard. So I hope that the bill remains intact. I understand that the gentleman from Arizona will make a slight concession and drop the increase for this year from 4½ to 4 percent. Other than that and the Congressman pay formula I do hope that this House will overwhelmingly approve this legislation, because it is good legislation.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in congratulating our committee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, TOM MURRAY, and the gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for his effective and able leadership in bringing the pay bill to the House floor here today.

I believe this is a good bill. Some members on the committee wanted to provide greater benefits than provided in this bill, particularly for our underpaid postal employees.

We provide a 4-percent increase in compensation; severance pay when employees are separated from the service through no fault of their own. Of major significance are the new provisions for overtime pay for postal employees. How can anyone possibly justify the current practice of working thousands of substitute postal employees 50 and 60 hours a week, week after week at straight time hourly rates with no overtime compensation?

The new salary rates under this bill still will not reach rates of comparability with private industry. Everyone, the administration, employee organizations, and most Members of Congress all agree with this principle of comparability, but we still have not attained it. All we can do is hope.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced the increased uniform allowance under section 116 is urgently needed as are the provisions under section 108 for relocation allowances when postal employees are required to move to a new city. This provision is most urgently needed now because of the closing of gateway railroad terminals in connection with establishment of the sectional center system.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I believe one of the best we can enact this year. I urge that favorable consideration be given here today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], a former member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and would like to add my compliments and commendation to the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and particularly to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], who was the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill. Having served as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for some years I think I can attest to the fact that it is a difficult task to legislate on Federal employee pay increases. It is not a simple matter of determining what percentage of increase we would like to give. It is not a matter of determining how much it will cost or how much we can afford to pay them. It is far more difficult and far more technical than that.

Here we are dealing with 2½ million jobs, 2½ million people, in many different areas of work and many different pay schedules which have to be considered.

Of course, there are several different levels and grades and the committee has to work out the relationship between those various jobs, those schedules, and those grades. It requires very close cooperation and coordination with the Civil Service Commission, and with other agencies in the executive branch. It re-

quires coordination and cooperation with the employees themselves, consultation with them, and particularly the employee organizations.

Right here and now I should like to pay tribute to the many Federal employees, and especially postal employee organizations for the great contribution they have made over the period of years not only to the political effort of getting these bills through but also the way in which those bills should be equitably written. The committee also has the problem of competing with private industry.

Mr. Chairman, most certainly here in the Federal Government we want to attract and keep the best type of employee. This, Mr. Chairman, brings up the principal reason why this type of legislation is so vital and so important. Here we are conducting the largest organization in the world, a big business, spending in excess of \$100 billion a year. As a result thereof we have to have approximately, as I said before, 2.5 million civilian employees to help us conduct this business. The Congress sits here as a board of directors. Most certainly in any big business—big or small for that matter—the board of directors is interested in good personnel management. That should be their principal concern.

Mr. Chairman, as members of this board we should be concerned about having the proper number of employees, no more than we need and certainly no less than we need, we should be concerned with job allocation and job supervision. More importantly, Mr. Chairman, than anything else we certainly must make certain that we are competitive in the salaries and wages which we pay these people upon whom we depend to conduct this business for us.

Mr. Chairman, in the past and possibly in this case, as well, there have been objections to the legislation because of the cost involved. I have said many times before in debate on similar bills that we cannot economize by cutting the salaries or refuse to proceed to properly increase the salaries of our Federal employees.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, we can argue about the distribution of these increases. This is what makes such a bill so difficult to write and so highly technical. We can disagree as to the number of employees and their assignment of work. We must not ignore the fact, however, that the only way we can properly compete with private industry and maintain efficiency in our Federal service is to pay at least comparable wages for comparable work.

Mr. Chairman, it would be far more costly in the long run to refuse to grant the increase in the cost of living and to make the salaries and wages of our employees competitive with that of private industry.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard these objections voiced in the past. If we had listened to those objections of the past and refused to grant the proper increases from time to time, we certainly would have had chaos in the management of our Federal personnel system and not have as high a quality of Federal employees as we have today.

Mr. Chairman, the way to economize in the Federal employee pay area and the only way that you can economize, is to reduce the program of services to the public generally or do not enact new programs. However, once we embark upon a program and enact it into law, we have got to make sure that we pay our employees what their counterparts receive in private industry based upon the general requirement of the work to be performed and the skills involved. We will find in the long run it will be a profitable investment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I wish to join others in commending our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], on an excellent statement in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in order to conserve time I want to subscribe to all of the remarks made by the gentleman from Arizona. I do not believe I could add at all to that statement or to the statement which was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI]. I subscribe to their statements in full, as I do to the statements of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the best that we could do under these particular circumstances, though the increase should have been greater.

Now, bear with me just one moment and I want to tell you that 25 years ago the average steelworker in America earned \$1,300 annually, while the average letter carrier 25 years ago earned \$2,100 annually. Now we are 25 years later and the same letter carrier carrying the same 35-pound sack of mail is earning about \$6,000 per year with that 25 years of service, and the average steelworker is making \$8,320 a year. So the letter carrier has not only been passed up, but he has been passed up to the extent of \$2,300 a year. Or, another way of saying it, he is about \$3,100 behind the job that he had 25 years ago.

We cite the letter carrier because he is quoted as the standard here in that he starts at PSF-4, and goes up into the postal field service 4 and 5. Other Federal workers in some degree remain comparable to the letter carrier.

Once again, this letter carrier with 25 years' experience finds himself \$2,300 behind the steelworker, when 25 years ago he was \$800 ahead of the average steelworker.

Under the 5-minute rule, I will present you with some comparable salaries, when we get to that part of the bill, and the amendment stage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation in its present form, the so-called Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. This bill is comparable to what? The price tag on it is scarcely comparable to any pay bill I have ever seen brought before us.

It has been said many times that there is nothing so easy as spending public money, for it appears to belong to no

one. Certainly in the case of this legislation there has been failure to act with a sense of responsibility to the taxpayers—the people who are going to foot the bill, and this is especially true in that provision of the bill which provides automatic pay increases for Members of Congress, executives, and members of the judiciary.

With respect to comparability, I wonder what formula was used in the proposed increase in the bill for the majority and minority leaders of the House? Both, under the terms of this bill, are to be increased \$5,000 a year.

I wonder what hearings were held by the subcommittee that produced justification for the increased pay in this bill for the majority and minority leaders?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The minority leader, I do not care whether it is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] or the gentleman from Massachusetts the great JOE MARTIN or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has almost as much responsibility as the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He is the spokesman for the minority party, he has heavy responsibilities and heavy duties, as well as heavy expenses. It has long seemed to me that he ought to be comparable to the Speaker, although he is not wholly comparable to the Speaker. The Speaker is increased by \$12,500 a year more than the other Members of the House because he has national and international responsibility, and it seems to me only fair that the minority leader should have some comparability.

Mr. GROSS. Is that as close as you can come to explaining comparability? If that is the explanation, it is what the gentleman from Arizona thinks they ought to have by way of an increase.

Mr. UDALL. It satisfied me. I suspect it would not satisfy the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. There are some figures that have come into the hearings in previous years, but we did not put them in this year. Those are the figures of the salaries of some of the officers of corporations of America. For instance, International Harvester, the president of that corporation gets \$124,000. The president of Martin-Marietta gets \$150,000.

Mr. GROSS. All right now, if you want to use figures from private industry and if you want to read the list of bonuses and stock holdings of these individuals, and all that sort of thing, I suggest that you yield me a little of your time in order to do it. But if you are going to quote corporation salaries as a basis of comparability—why did you stop at a \$5,000 increase for the minority and the majority leaders of the House?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Because in the higher brackets it has been the agreement of the committee that we cannot possibly compete with private industry.

Mr. GROSS. Well that is just what I am trying to get across.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. But we did do as well as we think we can.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I see.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. We are doing as well as we can in paying these people who are leaders in the House something more than the rest of the Members because of the added responsibilities that they have.

Mr. GROSS. But by your standard of comparability or the standard that you started out to use here is this as close as you can come? This is in the nature of kidding us a little bit about comparability; is it not?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. No, no, no. You know I would not try to kid you.

Mr. GROSS. Not much you would not—not much.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Let me give you another standard—not from private enterprise but from Government. Does the gentleman from Iowa think that the majority leader of the House of Representatives or the majority leader of the other body or the minority leaders in both bodies are less important and have less burdensome duties than the members of the President's Cabinet?

Mr. GROSS. Well, unfortunately, I am not able to gage very well the importance of the Cabinet members—I do not see them very often.

Mr. UDALL. How about the Supreme Court?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what the occasion is for any speed in debating this because I have not heard of any \$100-a-plate dinner in connection with this pay increase bill, that is, I have not heard that this pay increase bill is to be followed by a \$100-a-plate dinner for a Member of Congress as previously occurred.

We are asked to approve two salary increases, the cost of only one of which can be accurately estimated. The first phase includes a 4½-percent increase in salaries for all Federal workers plus the initiation of certain additional fringe benefits at a cost of \$621 million. The bill then provides for a second blank check increase to take effect automatically 12 months hence. That salary increase is to be pegged to so-called comparability surveys and while the cost can be guessed at there is no assurance whatever that it will be within the bounds of what the proponents claim.

Therefore, the best we have to go on is the "guestimate" that this legislation, once both phases of salary adjustment are in effect and the fringe benefits met, will have an annual cost of \$1.6 billion. President Johnson described this cost as "disastrous."

If my colleagues will examine some of the cost figures included in the report on this legislation they will find the fattest part of the fringe benefits cost in the

overtime provisions. This bill grants overtime benefits never before approached by any Government salary increase at an annual cost of some \$141 million.

Last year Congress gave itself a \$7,500 pay raise. Now, 1 year later, it proposes, this time by subterfuge, another raise. The estimates are that this raise will approximate \$3,000 to \$5,000 by the time of the effective date, which is the beginning of the 90th Congress. Thus, in effect, the vast majority of Representatives will have granted themselves a raise, in the period of 2 years, which will be somewhere between \$10,500 and \$12,500. This, I submit, is the height of self-esteem and self-adulation.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I understand an amendment is to be offered to delete this. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. GROSS. I have no way of knowing what will be offered to this bill.

Mr. LATTA. I will not and I cannot support the bill unless such an amendment to delete this is adopted.

Mr. GROSS. It is reported that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] will offer an amendment to cut the increase to Federal employees to 4 percent.

I do not know what change has been made since this bill was reported out of committee 2 months ago. I did not know there had been change in the comparability formula. So I do not know what is going to be offered to this bill by way of amendments. I regret that I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Only yesterday the gentleman from Arizona said, in dealing with the Sisk amendment, that before the sun went down yesterday evening we ought to write the formula for a District of Columbia home rule bill. He said we should not treat that matter on the basis of some time in the future, that we should be specific now.

Today the gentleman is asking you to approve a formula to increase the salaries of Members of Congress based upon no one knows what a year from now. It would be based upon the 4½ percent now, in the bill, plus something that occurs next year. And he had not the slightest idea of what the increase will be next year. One day the gentleman says, "Write the legislative ticket now. Do not fool around." Today he says, "Mañana—tomorrow, next week, a year from now we will write the ticket on congressional salaries, but we are going to make it automatic here today that there will be an increase."

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee bill, H.R. 10281. All things considered, this is an excellent bill and justifies overwhelming approval by the House of Representatives, and I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, the gentleman from Arizona [MORRIS UDALL], for his leadership.

I should like to direct the Members' attention especially to section 107 of the bill, entitled "Postal service overtime and holiday compensation." This certainly is one of the two or three most important reforms accomplished by H.R. 10281. Although in some respects it does not go as far as many of our committee members recommended, it nevertheless accomplishes a long-overdue and urgently needed modernization of overtime and holiday pay practices for postal employees.

First of all, it should be noted that the Postmaster General has officially recommended legislation looking toward this purpose, and his efforts are most commendable. However, the official administration proposal does not go all of the way to the heart of the problems. Section 107 of our committee bill will complete several important changes not included in the Postmaster General's recommendation.

I do not believe there can be any serious quarrel with the proposition that postal employees should receive time and one-half pay in cash when they are required to work more than 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week. This has been the general practice in private industry since early in the 20th century.

Even within the Federal Government itself—indeed, within the postal service—there is no uniformity of treatment of employees' overtime. Regular annual rate postal employees are paid premium compensation when called on to work more than 8 hours in a day or on days not within their regularly scheduled 40-hour workweeks. But the unfortunate postal substitute has struggled along without any provision for extra pay for overtime work. He can be called on to work 60 or 70 or 80 hours a week, including as much as 10 or 12 hours in one or more days, and is paid only at straight-time rates. This is a sorry situation that cries out for correction. The answer is found in section 107 of H.R. 10281. Nothing less will suffice if we are to do common justice to the thousands of substitute employees whose experience, abilities, and dedication are so needed by our postal service.

Another highly desirable improvement which will be brought about by this section is the designation of Sunday as an overtime work day. Again, it is the almost universal practice in private enterprise to exclude Sundays (and often Saturdays as well) from the workweek. Sunday work will be made an overtime day, compensated at time and one-half, by this legislation.

To touch briefly on the holiday pay provisions of section 107, they, too, are in line with moderate yet realistic private enterprise practices. There can be no serious challenge to the propriety of these provisions under which postal employees who work on any of the 8 legal holidays will receive an extra day's pay in addition to their regular day's pay—except for Christmas work, when a further half day's pay will be added. Double time for holidays is part and parcel of the economic fabric that has made this Nation great.

And so, I most earnestly and sincerely urge that the overtime and holiday pay provisions for postal employees embodied in section 107 of H.R. 10281 be approved and that any amendments to weaken these provisions or reduce their benefits be voted down.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would the gentleman agree with me that this is one of the most important improvements to be made in the Federal employees' salary schedules we have ever undertaken?

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It is one of the needed reforms which we endeavor to take care of by this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I congratulate the gentleman for a fine statement. I know he has done a great deal of work on this bill.

I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time we recognized the right of Federal employees to conditions comparable to those existing for workers in private industry. In so stating, I do not limit myself to the subject of wages.

With regard to fringe benefits such as overtime pay, holidays, and retirement, the people who work for our Government must not be treated as stepchildren.

I have always been pleased to support the principle of fair play for our postal workers and other Federal employees, and my vote on the pending bill will certainly follow the same pattern.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], a member of the committee.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, almost without fail every Member who has spoken on this bill has devoted at least a moment of time to commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for his handling of the bill, so I wish to join in commending the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], even though I do not agree with the bill he produced.

I do want the Members to know that he has worked harder in committee than any other Member, that he does more homework than any other Member, and I believe he deserves to be recognized as the most knowledgeable Member of the House on the subject of pay legislation, even though the result he produces may not be as satisfactory as I would like it to be.

Since I am addressing myself to the gentleman from Arizona, may I point out to him that 7 years ago, when I was a freshman in the House, his distinguished brother, who is now serving as our Secretary of the Interior, provided one of the great thrills of congressional debating history. That was at a time when Representative Stewart Udall from Arizona was participating in the debate on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

You may recall that at the time the good people of the country wanted labor reform and, for political reasons, some Members did not want labor reform. Representative Stewart Udall came in with a substitute to labor reform. I remember that he took his position here in the well of the House and in very dramatic fashion he raised his hand and said, "I carry into battle the banner of Speaker Sam Rayburn. I am carrying into battle the Speaker's bill."

Unfortunately for then Speaker Rayburn and then Representative Udall, he was defeated.

I feel that I am in the same position, because I am carrying into battle this afternoon the banner of Lyndon Johnson—and I face defeat.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished floor leader for the Johnson administration on this bill yield to me?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If you give me that title, does that mean I get the pay raise that the majority leader will be receiving?

Mr. UDALL. No, but the gentleman might have the title of rubberstamp, which some of us on this side have had for some time. I just wanted to congratulate him for carrying the banner of the Johnson administration. It is most commendable and something he has always done. He has never let the President down when he was needed.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Lest I be misunderstood may I point out my support of the Johnson administration is temporary. May I first, however, turn to my good friends on the Republican side and point out that as you know I have been quite a critic of this administration. I make it a point to call it power mad politically and point out the diabolic political motivation in most of their plans and in the different schemes I see forthcoming. However, when the administration is right they deserve support. In this case this afternoon the proposals advanced by the executive branch on the salary increases I believe are correct.

In turn I would like to point out to my good friends on the majority side that the President has shown his interest in proper management of Federal personnel. You cannot say by any stretch of the imagination that this administration is not mindful of the Federal civilian personnel. I think and I hope that allowing for the temporary lapse which we had yesterday when I understand some of the President's Members let him down, I would imagine that you would loyally support me as I present the position of the President. At least this is my hope. I am afraid, as I say, that I am going to be disappointed, but in this regard at least I am hopeful.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. When the able gentleman said that his support of the President was temporary, did he mean through 1972?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. I meant only this afternoon. As a matter of fact, this is the real key of this legislative situation. I had hoped there would be a

major effort made by the administration and more especially by the Post Office Department to have the House approve their basic recommendations. Of course, we all know that the Post Office Department has a problem at the moment. The Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski, as we know, is being exiled to Warsaw. The new Postmaster General has not accepted his responsibilities as yet. As a result, the Department is not fighting for its very meritorious position. So I stand alone. However, I would like to point out that last week, after I announced that I would carry the administration's banner into battle, the following morning I opened up my mail and there was an invitation to the White House. Of course, I was pleased at the instant recognition by the President of my support for his position. I have since discovered that every Member received the same invitation, so even socially I have not been able to get effective Presidential support. I do want to emphasize, and I refer you to the minority views which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] and the gentleman from Iowa, and I worked on, we thought we wrote a very devastating minority report. In fact, we thought it was devastating enough to have kept this bill bottled up in committee, but that did not develop, either. If you really want to know the truth about the bill, study that minority report again. It will be an hour before we vote. If you will remember that the poor President is preoccupied about Vietnam and beset with all sorts of other problems and is not really able to give the personal attention to this controversial pay bill, then, perhaps you will support some of my amendments. Incidentally, may I state when the gentleman from Arizona will introduce his amendment to reduce the salary increase figures from 4½ percent to 4 percent, at that point I will have a substitute to lower the figures to 3 percent, which is the recommendation of the executive branch of the Government. At that point I hope we can score a great victory for President Johnson.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, the American people are not dumb. They know that good men deserve good pay. They know that it is false economy to skimp in such a matter. They know that you have to pay decent salaries to get a decent product. The same thing applies to the Government. If you are going to get good men you are going to have to pay decent salaries.

This committee heard witnesses from various industries who reported the salaries that are received there. We examined the Government payrolls and we were found wanting. We are not comparable to industry. This bill will not quite make us comparable, but it is a step in that direction, and I certainly think this committee has done a fine job. Members of Congress realize how much hard work has been put into this matter.

I think one of the opponents to the bill awhile ago said something about

congressional pay and the question was whether that provision will be taken out or not. I should like to say this. I came up here last year as a freshman Congressman and the first thing that faced me was a vote on a pay raise for Congressmen. Everybody said, "If you vote for that you will not come back, you will just be a one-term Congressman."

Mr. Chairman, let me be frank with you. I did not think I could hardly get by with the pay of \$22,500 a year, but I was not going to give up the job because I liked it. I voted for the pay raise and when I got back home the first thing that happened was that I had five opponents and every one of them hollered, "This man goes up to Washington and the first thing he does is to vote himself a pay raise. Is that the kind of a man you want in Washington?"

They asked me to explain it. I got on television, and this is all I had to say. I just left it with the people of Texas whether I should come back here or not. I told them that the answer I gave them was that I just thought I was worth it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill we are discussing today—H.R. 10281—is a highly complicated package containing far-reaching provisions regarding pay, fringe benefits, and other proposals for the benefit of all civilian Federal workers.

I subscribe to the general policy that Federal workers should be treated fairly in terms of pay and conditions of work. The principle of comparability is sound. As a national policy, this principle must be constantly reviewed and updated in order that it be properly implemented. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should constantly work and strive to see that this policy is maintained.

There are two things that cannot be overlooked in any action taken to implement the comparability principle. One is the public interest and the second is the continuing responsibility of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There are some employees under civil service who refer to bills of this kind as "their pay bill." Statements of this kind do not fully state the case and also statements of this kind are in the minority. This bill is not just for the Federal workers. Their interest is not the only interest involved here.

There is also a public interest. When considering this interest, we in the Congress must realistically face the question of the effect this legislation will have on the Federal budget. It is estimated that this legislation will add over \$1.6 billion to the Federal budgetary requirements. This is an estimate only, because the actual amount of the second stage pay increase cannot be determined or pinpointed at this time.

Other questions which affect the public interest are what effect this bill will have on future mail service? What will

be the future deficit of the Post Office Department? That deficit for 1965 was running at the rate of \$783 million, and \$730 million for 1966. This bill could add over \$500 million annually to the cost of operating the Post Office Department. With these rising costs, what will happen to future mail service? Will postal workers' jobs be adversely affected because of these rising deficits? Also, what effect will this rising deficit have on future postal rates? Will postal patrons have to pay more for their stamps?

Now, what about the continuing responsibility of the committee to oversee the implementation of the comparability principle?

There are two features to this bill which would abdicate the responsibility of the committee and of the Congress. One is the automatic pay increase for Federal workers to go into effect in 1966. We are saying with this legislative language that the Congress will keep hands off, wash its hands of any responsibility for any increases in salaries for next year. Also under the formula in the bill, no estimates are available as to what increases will actually be made. The committee report gives only vague estimates. It could very well be that many workers could be treated unfairly by turning this responsibility over to a Federal agency outside of the Congress. I believe strongly that we should retain congressional control over any pay adjustments. I hope this feature of the bill is stricken. The Congress will be in session next year. At that time the committee can again go into this whole subject with full hearings.

The other feature of the bill which would abdicate the responsibility of the committee and the Congress, is the automatic pay increase for Members of Congress. Contrary to rumors which have been circulating that there is an agreement to take congressional pay out of this bill, I know of no such agreement. When you vote for this bill, you are voting a salary increase for yourselves. With the way the language is written, the amount of that increase is unknown. It could be anywhere from \$2,500 to \$3,500 annually. This is on top of the \$7,500 increase which was approved last year. I feel that this language, which appears under section 205 should be stricken. Some Members might read this language and not realize its full meaning. However, a pay increase for Members of Congress is in there, it is camouflaged. When we vote for this we are hiding behind the Federal workers, cashing in on the comparability principle, and riding the coattails of postal and other Government employees.

Let us delete this section. Then, the Federal Salary Review Commission, which is established by section 202, can make recommendations to the Congress, which not only involve or effect Federal workers, but Members of Congress as well. We can take those recommendations and then take such action on congressional pay as we want.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. It is incorrect to say that any Member of this House will be asked today to vote himself a pay raise. Any pay raise that is provided in this bill will be effective at the very earliest in 1967, after a new Congress has been elected. It is not technically correct to say, and I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina will agree, that anyone is voting himself a pay raise. He may be voting for a possible pay raise for the next congressman from his district, whom-ever that may be.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would say to the gentleman from Arizona that the vast majority of the Members of this House of Representatives, more than likely, are going to be candidates for reelection and they know that at the time they are voting on this proposal. So, in that respect they are voting themselves a pay increase, at least for some future date.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Is there a plan to offer an amendment that would delete that section which is a concern to a lot of the Members?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I understand that there are certain Members who are planning to offer amendments on this section. There may be various amendments.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I believe it is safe to say that most of the Members of Congress, certainly in checking this question of comparability—and we are in concurrence with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] has said—believe it certainly is a wise investment to protect adequate salaries. I do not believe there is any disagreement on this. However, certainly there is a matter of concern to many Members of Congress with reference to the matter of congressional pay increases.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. This is a point I would like to make, that when we vote for this we are hiding behind the Federal workers. We are actually trying to cash in on this comparability principle. We are trying to ride the coattails of the postal workers and other Government employees.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this section is deleted.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281. This measure is essential to the achievement of a salary system based upon a comparability principle which is the ultimate goal sought to be achieved on behalf of civilian Government personnel. Because others have discussed or will discuss other sections of the bill, my remarks will be limited to section 112. I do this because I originally introduced a separate bill, H.R. 8424, granting long-needed severance pay benefits to Federal employees. I am happy to report that my

bill in its entirety has been incorporated into section 112 of the measure we are now considering. Section 112 will correct a deficiency in Federal employee benefits by providing reasonable severance pay allowances to Federal employees who are separated from the service through no fault of their own and have not yet become eligible for immediate civil service retirement benefits. I am grateful that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in reporting H.R. 10281, recognized the merits of my proposal, which was prompted by an official recommendation advanced by the President in his message to the Congress on May 12, 1965.

The need for severance pay has recently been emphasized by the plight of employees who have lost their jobs in the shutdowns of certain Federal installations such as naval shipyards and Veterans' Administration hospitals. Many of these employees had devoted many years of loyal service to our Government. In a large number of cases no similar jobs were available which could utilize their special skills. Reductions in force have occurred in the past and will continue to occur. About 1,400 find themselves in this plight every month. Moreover technological changes are advancing rapidly in Federal service, and future changes in techniques may well force increasing numbers of Federal workers out of their jobs.

While economy and efficiency of operations must continue to be the primary objective of Federal management, the hardships to workers which ensue should also be taken into account. The severance pay provision will accomplish the Federal management objective in an equitable manner.

Current provisions for early retirement, annual leave, and unemployment compensation, help cushion the blow of financial burdens upon many discharged Federal workers. However, no provisions now exist to compensate the worker for disruption inevitably associated with loss of employment and loss of seniority-related benefits earned through years of loyal service. Lump sum payments for unused annual leave have some beneficial effect, but these benefits are not designed for the purpose of aiding involuntarily separated employees. The Government lags far behind the growing number of private employers who provide some form of severance pay for laid-off employees. Section 112 of H.R. 10281 will help cure this defect so that the comparability principle which the President has recently reaffirmed will be much nearer full achievement.

The severance pay section applies to all civilian officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government—including each corporation owned or controlled by the United States—the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

The basic allowance will be 1 week's pay, at the employee's rate immediately before separation, for each of his first 10 years of civilian service for which no other severance pay has been received,

plus 2 weeks' pay on the same basis for each year of service beyond 10. An additional 10 percent is provided for each year the recipient is over 40 years old. The maximum amount payable is limited to an equivalent of 1 year's salary at time of separation. Furthermore, no severance pay will be allowable, unless the employee has been continuously employed 12 months immediately prior to separation.

Appropriate provisions are also made for adjustments in the case of any person who is reemployed after having been granted severance pay, and for disposition of unpaid severance pay in the case an employee entitled dies before expiration of the period. Payments would be made at regular pay period intervals, rather than in a lump sum, so that an employee who is later reemployed by another Federal agency before his benefit period expires would not be faced with repayment to the Government. Where an entitled employee dies, the severance payments will be made to his legal heirs, as if such deceased person were living.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for us to recognize the need to place our Government employees on a par with those in private industry. If we fail to do this, there will always be a serious drain of talent from the Government into private industry. The Federal Government must meet the growing competition from private business now.

A mere increase in salary alone would not strengthen the career civil service. Fringe benefits, comparable to those provided by private industry, must be included. This measure before us includes such provisions and will mark a major step toward the achievement of our expressed goal of comparability.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 10281.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. In my opinion, it is urgently required both in fairness to Federal employees and in order to insure to our Government personnel of the highest integrity and competence. This bill represents a significant step forward in meeting the Federal Government's responsibility to its employees.

As many of you recall, back in 1962, Congress adopted the principle of comparability. This principle was designed to insure that classified and postal salaries be comparable with private industry.

Such a concept was a milestone in Federal employee legislation; and, undoubtedly, it has helped to close the gap between Government and private pay scales. The comparability standard, however, has not been strictly followed, and Federal salaries still lag behind those of private industry.

The Department of Labor's statistics, for example, continue to indicate that raises of up to 11 percent are required if Government and business compensation are to be equalized.

It is imperative then, that we get on with the job of passing this pay raise. We cannot afford to delay action on the

bill. The fact is that today Federal employees are not being paid for what they deserve for the services they are rendering their Government.

With a gradually increasing cost-of-living, it is becoming more and more difficult for many Federal employees to meet their financial obligations and properly support their families.

This to me, is an intolerable situation. Congress and the American people owe a great deal to the untiring efforts of our civil servants. We must depend upon these dedicated men and women for the effective functioning of every branch of the Government. Without their unselfish devotion to duty, this country could not hope to retain its position as the leader of the free world. And while on the subject of devotion to duty, I should like to add a special word on behalf of the postal service.

The role of the postal employee in our country cannot be overemphasized. He represents the Federal Government in every village, town and hamlet in this Nation. Often, he may be the only contact a citizen has with his Government in Washington. That citizen depends on his local post office for much of what he knows and feels about the Federal Government. The impression that the postal worker—or for that matter any Government employee—makes on thousands of his fellow citizens each day is often their lasting impression of the Federal Government.

We, in the Congress, should be proud that the Federal employee has not betrayed this trust, that, rather, he has fulfilled it with vigor and dedication. In short, the Federal employee has been pulling his share of the load. But what about his employer?

Since the comparability standard was adopted in 1962, Federal employee salaries have not kept pace with private industry. This situation has continued to exist despite the passage of repeated pay boosts.

I cannot stress too much, therefore, the importance of this Federal pay raise legislation. The opposition may attack this bill as just another handout from a summertime Santa Claus. But that is simply not the case. What we are trying to do here is to pass a bill that will insure a fair salary for every Federal employee; and at the same time, mount a concentrated effort to bring the Government more in line with its own concept of a comparability standard. This piece of legislation represents the minimum that is required at this time.

Clearly, the Federal Government cannot continue to recruit the best talent for every position unless it is willing to adjust the imbalance in the salaries of Federal and private employees.

Let me quote to you some of the late President Kennedy's remarks concerning a public service career. In his first state of the Union address, he said:

Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and with honor in future years—I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need.

Yes, the public service is a proud and lively career. And it is squarely up to the Congress to insure that it continues to be in the months and years ahead.

If ever there was a must piece of legislation this is it, and I ask each of my colleagues to give this bill his most serious and favorable consideration. Both justice to Federal workers and the public advantage of the country call us to support this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], a member of the committee, 2 minutes.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my accolades to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of the subcommittee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

In the city from which I come, we have 10,000 post office employees and approximately 50,000 Federal employees. This is a boon to them.

Mr. Chairman, I think the principle of comparability of salaries and wages paid to workers in private industry and workers and employees of the Federal Government should have been introduced long ago. It is the only method by which we are assured of constant study and judgments based upon investigation and experience of many sources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only note of criticism that has been raised is as to that portion of the bill which in the year 1967 would increase the salaries of the Members of Congress.

But a singular thing occurred in the committee, and I was responsible for it. It was this: No Member of this Congress is compelled to avail himself of the increase. He can always say, "I will return it to the Treasury of the United States."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the author of the bill? I am taking this time for the purpose of asking a question or two. My questions are not hostile, but I am seeking information. I have discussed the subject with various Government employees, particularly postal employees, when we have been discussing comparability. I believe no one would argue against the concept that the Government should pay to its employees wages which are comparable to wage scales in private industry. But I have never been able to get anyone to tell me with whose salary a mail carrier's pay should be compared. How do you arrive at comparability? What is the criterion? What are the guidelines?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. In 1962, when we first accepted the administration proposal and set up a comparability system, this was one of the most heated and divisive points of argument. The employee organizations said, with some justification, what you have said today: "Who in the world can you compare a mail carrier to?"

Finally it was agreed that you had to make some sort of arbitrary comparison. The comparability figures ordinarily were basically established for the classified service—not the postal service, but the classified service.

Finally, a comparison was made; it was decided that we would link PF-4's, which is the letter carrier level, with GS-5, and that is the level at which the college graduate enters. The college graduate with a basic college degree enters the Federal service at that point.

To answer the gentleman's question, there is no occupation with which you could compare a mail carrier.

Mr. JONAS. That is what I thought. It is an arbitrary decision, because there is no occupation with which you could compare a postal worker, that is, a mail carrier.

Mr. UDALL. That is correct. It was my judgment and the judgment of the majority of the committee at that time that this was a fair comparison to make, that we should link it with the level of the classified service which I have mentioned.

Mr. JONAS. I should like to ask another question. Recently, we had Mr. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. He was asked that question. He said that in order to arrive at a figure which is used for comparability, the Commission takes a given number of metropolitan areas in the United States—and I do not remember the number, and arrives at an average wage or salary scale in those metropolitan areas. The result is what is used to consider comparability.

Is that your understanding of the way they arrive at a figure which is used in arriving at comparability?

Mr. UDALL. Approximately. A much larger number of areas are used. I wish the gentleman would get the hearing record. We went into this question very carefully.

Mr. JONAS. What I am asking, and what I thought you could answer in a short sentence or two, is the following question: In determining the figure that will be used to consider whether comparability exists or not, are only wage scales in metropolitan areas considered, or are wage scales in rural communities, small towns, and medium-sized towns around the country also considered?

Mr. UDALL. These are different areas in the Nation—not entirely metropolitan, but largely metropolitan. The truth of the matter is that 80 percent of the Federal employees work in metropolitan areas. That is why it is more fair to do it in the way I have mentioned.

Mr. JONAS. What about the other 20 percent? The committee report advocates comparability and I think we all favor that, but I am trying to find out what factors are used in determining the wage scales with which the pay of Government employees is compared. Whose work is it compared with?

Mr. UDALL. They try to find a job which is identical with, or nearly identical with, a Federal job. The BLS people actually go in to see what the man

does, what responsibility he has, and then they compare this with a Federal job at a particular level and try to find a matching comparison. It is a very scientific and thorough job. I wish the gentleman would read the transcript of our hearings, because we went into this in some detail.

Mr. JONAS. The transcript will not be available to all who read the RECORD. I was trying to get a simple statement showing what is meant by comparability as used by the committee in its report and as advocated by many speakers here today. Comparable with whom? You say private industry. Does this mean autoworkers in Detroit, steelworkers in Pittsburgh, or what group of employees in private industry and what industries? I think those who read the RECORD should have this information so they will know what action is taken.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281, as reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with this reservation: In my judgment, salary increases substantially greater than the 4½-percent increases provided by the bill are fully justified by the record. The 4½-percent increases fall far short of the percentage required to carry out the policy of comparability with private enterprise pay rates that was laid down by the Congress in Public Law 87-793.

However, the committee bill is the best that could be worked out under the circumstances. It is my hope that the shortcomings can be corrected later by legislation guaranteeing complete and current comparability of Federal civilian salaries with those in private enterprise.

My remarks are directed particularly to section 107 of the bill, which contains extremely important provisions to modernize the outmoded overtime and holiday pay practices of the postal field service.

When our committee began consideration of salary legislation earlier this year, I undertook a study of employment and compensation policies in the Federal Government. I was at first amazed, and then shocked, to find our Federal Government—which should be a leader—completely out of step with private enterprise in its treatment of overtime and holiday work by postal employees. Quite frankly, it seemed inconceivable to me that this situation could exist and—even worse—that no more than half-way corrective measures were being considered by the Post Office Department.

It borders on the absurd, in this day and age, to have to argue before the Congress of the United States for legislation to grant premium pay for postal employees who are officially called on to work more than 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week or on their Sabbath. This principle has been so long accepted and practiced in private industry that a mere reference to areas in which it has not been applied should assure enactment of legislation to cure the defects. As a matter of fact, the Government itself has espoused the cause and by law applied it

in the private sector of our economy—but carelessly overlooked placing its own house in order.

President Johnson strongly reaffirmed the principle of comparability between Federal civilian salaries and those for equal levels of responsibility in private industry in his message on salary increases submitted to the Congress on May 12, 1965. He declared that:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted. In the long run, it costs more.

I thoroughly agree with the President's statement that "a double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted." Yet the overtime and holiday pay conditions that exist today in our postal field service constitute a glaring example of a double standard that it not only grossly unfair to employees but adverse to the interests of the Government. This is an area where comparability is long overdue.

Thousands upon thousands of postal employees work millions of hours of overtime each year at straight-time hourly pay. It is common practice, moreover, to work them inordinately long hours—as much as 70 or 80 hours a week, week in and week out. It is unfair and inhumane to the employees and costly to the Post Office Department. Certainly, such excessive work assignments represent inefficient use of manpower and, at straight-time pay rates, an imposition on the workers.

I believe it appropriate, at this point, to call attention to the comment of the President's Panel on Federal Pay concerning overtime work. The Panel in its report to the President said, in part:

The question of premium pay for overtime work has commanded the attention of the Federal Government and of other government jurisdictions.

This issue was not before the Panel, but there was brought to our attention the facts that Federal overtime pay practices are not consistent and that, because of certain statutory restrictions, employees in some Government activities, and particularly in the Post Office Department, have work schedules which result in uneconomical overtime, as well as in far too long hours of work for certain categories of employees. This is unduly costly to the Government and unfair to the employees.

The Panel urged acceleration of plans to hire a sufficient number of employees to reduce or eliminate uneconomical overtime, and recommended, as soon as practicable thereafter: "enactment of legislation authorizing all rank and file civilian employees paid under the statutory systems to receive premium pay equally and on a basis comparable with industry practices when overtime work is necessary."

The Panel went on, then, to again stress that "the need for action is particularly acute in the Post Office Department."

Unfortunately, when the Postmaster General submitted the official administration recommendation for changes in

overtime and holiday pay provisions for the postal field service, it was not in accord with the Panel's recommendation. The proposal falls far short of providing comparability with industry practices. To bring the postal field service program reasonably in line with industry practices—which, mind you, are based on historic Federal legislative policy—the provisions of section 107 of H.R. 10281 represent minimum requirements and should be promptly enacted into law.

Section 107 modernizes the antiquated overtime and holiday pay provisions now applicable to postal field service employees.

Subsection (a) limits any employee to 12 hours of work a day except for emergencies determined by the Postmaster General. The existing limitation of 8 hours regularly scheduled work in 10 hours of any day is continued for regular employees. An added improvement is a new limitation under which the work-span of any other employee may not be extended over more than 12 consecutive hours.

A basic 5-day, Monday-through-Friday, workweek is established for all postal field service employees, with authority in the Postmaster General to establish a basic workweek including Saturday where necessary to provide service. Senior annual rate regular employees will have priority of preference for the Monday-through-Friday workweek, but may select some other workweek if they desire.

Subsection (b) defines overtime work for three general employee groups—annual rate regular, hourly rate regular, and substitute employees. In brief, for the first group overtime work is any work in excess of the basic workweek schedule or on a Sunday. For the second group, it is work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week or on a Sunday. For the third group it is work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. Regular annual rate employees already have the 40-hour week provision.

An employee in salary level 10 or below will receive time and one-half the regular hourly rate for his overtime work. Employees in level 11 or above will receive compensatory time or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be paid time and one-half the regular rate or the highest rate of salary level 10, whichever is the lesser.

This subsection also authorizes double time, as is the practice in private enterprise, for work on legal holidays except Christmas, if the employee is in salary level 10 or below. If he is in salary level 11 or above, he will be granted compensatory time or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be paid double time. For work on Christmas Day employees will receive the equivalent of double time plus one-half.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the administrative views on this important section of our committee bill, I submit that enactment of section 107 is essential under the comparability principle. It is distinctly in the interest of efficiency and good manpower utilization

in the postal service, as well as in common justice to postal employees. I strongly urge the adoption of the entire section with the amendments which will be offered at an appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, the Federal policy established the Davis-Bacon Act on March 3, 1931, which requires that every Government contract for construction, alteration, or repair of a public building, if the contract price exceeds \$2,000, contain a stipulation that the contractor and all subcontractors pay their various classes of mechanics and laborers minimum wages based on local prevailing rates for corresponding classes of workers on similar non-Government projects, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The Federal policy established the Walsh-Healey Act on June 30, 1936, which requires that each Government contract for the manufacturing or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment, if the contract price exceeds \$10,000, shall include stipulations that, first, all persons employed by the contractor will be paid not less than the minimum wages determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the local prevailing wage rates for similar work; and second, no employee of the contractor will be allowed to work over 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week except upon payment of overtime compensation.

The Federal policy established the Contract Work Hours Standards Act, Public Law 87-581, 76 Stat. 357.

In 1962, the Congress passed the Contract Work Hours Standards Act which establishes a standard 8-hour workday, and 40-hour workweek, applicable with respect to all laborers and mechanics employed on a public work of the United States. This provision requires the payment of wages at the rate of time and a half for work in excess of the standard workday or standard workweek.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to close with one thought which relates to the question of fiscal integrity and fiscal responsibility. I want to say that this is something that I have heard a whole lot about, but I wonder how it could be explained to the taxpayers of this country if someone were to bring to their attention the fact that on September 13, 1965, excluding the cost of the pay of the reading clerks, the parliamentary clerks, the parliamentarian, the tally clerk, the bill clerk, the reporters of debates, the sergeant-at-arms, the pages, the door-men, and the floor telephone service and all of the other employees of the Capitol, the taxpayers of the United States paid out of the Treasury for excessive quorum calls and excessive rollcalls the frightening sum of \$254,000 for 1 day of rollcalls that were designed not for their original and salutary purpose but for the purpose of thwarting the legislative process.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my questions are directed to Mr. UDALL. I concur with him, and I believe with our Congress, that we should have comparability in our system of pay for Federal Government employees. I would like to know to what hospitals he turned to find the comparability feature. I just called one of the best hospitals in southeastern Massachusetts, which is part of the greater Boston complex. I find that the average chief nurse gets about \$8,600 per year whereas the average chief nurse at a small veterans hospital will start out at close to \$10,000. I find that the average registered nurse at a charitable hospital starts out at about \$5,000 whereas the average registered nurse in the VA would probably start out closer to \$6,000. I find that most of the charitable and private hospitals have no pension plan, seldom any group insurance, and oftentimes only have 2 weeks' vacation, and no severance pay. My question is where did you go to find the comparability features for hospital salaries.

Mr. UDALL. Well, I would say to the gentleman that comparability is a concept which has been applied to the classified employees and the general schedule employees and the postal employees. The gentleman is referring to the Veterans' Administration employees, I take it. They come under an entirely different system. Basically the comparability comparisons are made only as between private industry and Federal Government employees. There is no attempt to compare as between State hospitals, local hospitals, and county hospitals and that sort of thing.

Mr. KEITH. This makes it very difficult for the local hospitals in greater Boston, and in fact throughout the entire country, to compete for personnel with neighboring Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, a previous speaker this afternoon referred to the author of this bill as the most astute Member of this House on the issue under discussion. I wholeheartedly agree with this comment and on the basis of this tribute alone I would suggest the passage of this bill unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in behalf of H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965, because I believe wholeheartedly that this bill represents a sound, progressive, and responsible congressional approach to the continuing duty to provide a fair and equitable Federal salary system. I support the bill as it was reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I urge all of you to support the bill as it stands. It is the best possible bill.

I shall direct my remarks to four features of H.R. 10281: the second stage pay increase to be effective in October of 1966, the overtime provisions, the postal seniority salary adjustments, and severance pay.

To my way of thinking, the second stage of pay increases represents a prudent exercise of the responsibility of the

Congress to give full faith and credit to the great legislative declaration that there ought to be comparability, equal pay for equal work, in Federal and private enterprise salaries. Briefly, the second stage involves an increase in pay equal to one-half of the percentage by which salary rates paid for the same level of work in private enterprise for the months of February and March of 1965 exceed the salaries of Federal employees. Added to this will be a percentage increase based on the increase in private enterprise salaries between March of 1965 and March of 1966.

This proposal will bring about a partial solution to the thorny problem of correcting comparability inequities at the various levels of work and responsibility within the Federal employment system. Needless to say, such a problem cannot be corrected by an across-the-board dollar or percentage increase. It is clear that in a number of Federal positions the comparability lag or gap is much greater than in others, and we have in this second stage pay increase mechanism a means to wipe out, across the board, one-half of the gap. I wish to reiterate once again my support for this section of H.R. 10281. It is crucial to the committee's effort to present to the Congress a way of achieving comparability.

The second feature of H.R. 10281, on which I want to comment, is the provision for overtime pay. Our committee report calls this a major breakthrough, and it really is. This section affects particularly employees in the postal field service. The report makes mention of the archaic and inequitable set of strictures in the field of overtime work and overtime pay. This bill provides that postal employees in level 10 and below be paid time and one-half for overtime work in excess of 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week. Premium pay is also provided for work performed on holidays. Such practices have long been in effect in many enlightened private businesses. For some classes of postal workers, the present procedure of being rewarded with compensatory time for overtime work, in addition to being unfair, has proved meaningless. Compensatory time assumes that the employee who works overtime can arrange to take time off from his regular duties during periods when his workload is not so heavy. If it develops, and it often does, that the employee cannot be spared, he ends up with neither overtime pay nor extra time off. This seems to me to be unfair. The bill removes the inequity of not rewarding substitute employees with overtime pay when they work in excess of 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week.

Another feature of H.R. 10281, added in the interest of sound personnel management, is the stipulation that any employee who was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962, and who is senior in terms of total postal service to an employee in the same post office who was promoted after October 13, 1962, and who is in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee, must be advanced to that step held by his colleague with less total

postal service. In order to make sure that such situations as this are corrected, H.R. 10281 requires the Postmaster General to see to it. It is only reasonable that we provide that an employee with the Post Office Department, doing the same work side by side with a colleague of less total service, receive the same compensation which his junior receives.

The last feature of H.R. 10281, on which I would like to comment, is the provision for a form of severance pay for Federal employees who, through no fault of their own, become separated from the service and have not yet become eligible for immediate civil service retirement benefits. That there is a need for a form of severance pay for Federal employees like this has become very clear to me in recent months as the results of a number of relocations and consolidations of Federal agencies in my district have become apparent. Good, hard working, civil servants with 15 or 20 years of service find themselves out in the cold without work and without retirement. Naturally severance pay is not the answer to their problem, but it will be a form of assistance.

Again I want to affirm my support for H.R. 10281 and for all of its provisions, and I would ask my colleagues to support the bill, and to approve it without amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER].

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this much needed salary bill for civil servants. I am here, however, briefly to urge that there be omitted from this bill that section which provides an increase in salary for Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with some of my colleagues about the work that Members of Congress have done. Certainly, it can be said, and not entirely facetiously, this is probably one of the few groups of people who are working overtime without time and a half pay. We have experienced that situation at this session.

However, Mr. Chairman, I believe there are some serious factual objections to the manner in which salary increases for Members of Congress has been presented to the House.

I appreciate also the suggestion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] concerning those Members who disagree with this proposal. He recommended that they turn back their salary increase in 1967. I am on public record as being perfectly willing to do that if I am in the Congress, in the 90th Congress, and if this bill is passed in its present form I feel an obligation to the civil servants who need a salary increase and will vote for this bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk briefly about the objections that I have to this section. I do not intend to call it a subterfuge. Unfortunately, I believe there are many people who believe this, however. I believe that this committee should have followed its earlier judgment by setting up a bipartisan, blue-ribbon commission to study this problem. This commission could objectively have presented us with the

facts upon which we could have acted separately from this measure.

Mr. Chairman, the main objections that I have to including this feature in the bill at this time are these:

First, salary increases for Members of Congress should not be tied in with the increase contemplated for Federal civil servants. It is true, of course, that supporters of such a combination argue that there is a relationship between levels of salary for civil servants, Cabinet officers, and Members of Congress. There is a basic difference, however, in that Members of Congress are hereupon asked to act directly in their own behalf. I feel that a far sounder approach would be the development of a bipartisan blue-ribbon congressional salary commission to make recommendations to be acted upon by the Congress after adequate study, separate from any salary schedules for other public servants.

Second, and an even more fundamental consideration which I would like to raise, is that many assumptions have been made concerning the so-called relationship between salaries of public servants, whether in the administrative, policymaking executive and legislators, and executives in private corporations. It has sometimes been argued that salaries in public life should be made comparable to those in private business. Most business executives are hard-working individuals. But I would like to point out candidly that the setting of executive salaries in some private businesses obviously bears no relationship to the amount of work performed or the eligibility of those who receive them. Several recent stockholder revolts have shown the nature of the problem. Frequently, those levels are determined by the fact that some executives in private organizations, because of their economic control of the organization, are able to determine what level of salaries and other increments such as stock option incentives that they may receive. Members of Congress are rightfully subject to another set of considerations, the most important of these being their responsibility to a large number of people in the electorate who, like Members of Congress, are not really free to set their income and salaries at whatever level they so determine. Consequently, I would like to recommend in consideration of this and subsequent congressional salary legislation that we create an objective commission to determine periodically on a sensible basis the salary needs of Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state I will support an amendment to this bill that would strike the section providing automatic pay increases for Members of Congress.

I am not making any judgment on the merits of a congressional raise in 1967 or at any other time. However, I do feel that this matter should be handled separately.

Even such a move as delaying the effective date of the increase merely side-

steps the issue of treating congressional salaries apart from the regular Federal pay system.

In view of the fact that Congress last year voted itself a 33-percent raise while at the same time voting the classified service pay raises averaging 4.3 percent, I feel that this year we should devote ourselves to improving the lot of the classified, postal, and Federal employees of other categories. Congressmen should not be forced to choose between voting themselves a significant raise or denying badly needed increases to the Federal employees.

By handling the matter separately, the American people will have the benefit of the debate on the floor and can judge the merits of the case as they see it.

Congress should not be afraid to vote its own pay raises in the spotlight of publicity. Either the people are convinced that the Congressman is worth what he is paid or they are not. At any rate our decision must be made in full view of the public—not by an obscure reference to the United States Code buried deep in the next to last page of the bill.

I believe that the rest of the bill is badly needed, and I have been urging its enactment. My district has one of the largest groups of Federal employees in the country and I am well aware that their salaries lag behind those received by employees doing comparable work in private industry. These people are the backbone of the entire Nation. Although the laws are made by Congress, the success of their intent is completely in the hand of the Federal employee that administers the legislation. For this reason alone, we must provide every possible incentive to attract competent and dedicated employees to the Federal service and to keep the ones that we have.

I want there to be no misunderstanding about the intent of my amendment. It is not to take a position on the merits of a congressional pay raise. It is simply to separate two important issues so that the vitally needed Federal employees pay raise is not jeopardized in any way. I do not want to see a single vote lost for this important bill because a Congressman did not see fit to vote himself a pay raise.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL].

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am however opposed, as stated by the previous speaker, to the congressional provision contained in this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment prepared to this bill in connection with this so-called House Employees Classification Act. However, I understand this amendment is not germane to this bill.

I would like to say a word on this subject, as I have had numerous complaints during the past year from employees connected with the Sergeant at Arms, the Office of House Disbursing, the Doorkeeper's Office, and all other housekeeping activities here on Capitol Hill.

I have been in Congress quite a while, and I feel very close to this branch of the Government. I think it is the duty of the House Members to provide for the housekeeping activities of Capitol Hill. The minute we leave it to the Civil Service or General Services to take over certain agencies of the House of Representatives, we are going to be in trouble.

I will present this amendment in the form of a bill, and will go before the House Administration Committee in an effort to repeal Public Law 88-652.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Earlier in this session the gentleman sponsored a bill to do away with the Classification Act we passed last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; the gentleman from Maryland is correct.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I did set a date for a hearing on it before the Subcommittee on Accounts but we had to postpone the hearing.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. The gentleman has offered to assist me with this proposed legislation. Each time we were trying to have a hearing something happened. It was my fault that we could not get a date for the hearing that was convenient to all concerned parties.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think we can set another date for the hearing the early part of January.

Mr. McMILLAN. When this legislation was before the House for consideration during the last Congress I was advised at that time the purpose of the legislation was to grant retirement benefits to employees of the folding rooms, and several other agencies in the Capitol. I did not know it went so far as to have civil service regulations on Capitol Hill.

Mr. FRIEDEL. One of the purposes of the Classification Act was to permit certain groups of employees in the House to obtain coverage under the Retirement Act. But it is also designed to provide a fair system of determining salaries on the basis of the work performed. No one had their salary reduced under Public Law 88-652 and some received increases.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think it has done a good job, and I think it has served its purpose, now, I think it is time to repeal it. The Senate had a similar act in force 3 months and they decided to repeal it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have had a few complaints from employees who feel they should be in a higher classification and we will have their supervisors, the Sergeant at Arms, the Clerk, the Doorkeeper, and others at the hearings when we consider these complaints.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the act has done a good job in adjusting some irregularities.

I include the following:

A BRIEF ANALYSIS BY THE CLERK OF THE APPLICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HOUSE EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 88-652

After nearly 6 months' experience with the application of the House Employees Classification Act, Public Law 88-652, I am more con-

vinced now than I was at the time it was enacted, during the closing hours of the last Congress, that it is neither a good or workable law. Its limited application has made it crystal clear that you cannot make a partial application of a neo-civil-service type of classification apply to one-tenth of the employees of this House without creating greater inequity, less coordination, and advancing an individual and piecemeal basis of consideration.

A commingling of a partial Federal civil service system superimposed upon the political system of the legislative branch is not workable. Experience shows that it gives few of the advantages inherent in the civil service classification system as applied to the executive branch of the Federal Government while retaining all of the disadvantages, limitations, and hazards of employment peculiar to the legislative branch. This condition is illustrated by the following:

1. This law and its implementation does not pay due regard to differences in levels of difficulty, responsibility, and classification requirements of work, while giving little consideration to the kinds of work performed, length of service, or satisfactory performance.

2. Unlike the executive branch, Civil Service System, it fails to recognize in its application the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work.

3. It very definitely deprecates and limits the authority previously invested by the House in the elective officers covered by its provisions and subordinates every employee of the officers coming within the purview of this act to the status of second-class employees, because:

(a) The elective officer of the House may not make selection of employees with any predetermined assurance as to the rate of pay that will be provided under this system. This failure to invest him with authority to appoint with full assurance to the individual so appointed of a definite salary rate brings about a lack of confidence in him and undermines the control and superintendence necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the rules of the House.

(b) No employee under this system can look up to the full rate of pay which is provided as a possibility for all other employees of Government. The schedule adopted pursuant to this act places a lower ceiling on the rate of pay than all other employees and puts a further subceiling on a great many of them by placing each in the highest step of a level, thus preventing them from benefiting by any possible longevity advances. His only resort is to appeal to the very authority which created this condition.

(c) The exercise of this discretion and the advice to the committee appears to be presently lodged with an individual who is imbued with the philosophy of the Federal civil service system and who possesses little or no understanding or desire to understand the process inherent in the legislative branch system. He appears further, to lack the humanness to give patient consideration to appeals from decisions made, thus shutting the door to any hope of a successful appeal from a previous determination. This is certainly repugnant to our philosophy of government and rights of the individual and certainly not in keeping with what would be done in the executive branch under the system previously served by this individual. It is a condition which one would think the House of Representatives, the first line of defense of freedom of all citizens, would not tolerate to any degree.

It is quite significant that while this act is made to apply to the offices of the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, employing less than 500 persons, or one-tenth of the total number of employees of the House of Representatives, it does not apply to the Office of the Parliamen-

tarian, the Coordinator, the legislative counsel, the official reporters of debates of the House and committees, employees of standing committees and of special and select committees, nor to all employees under the jurisdiction of such officer or official. If the virtues of this system are as advantageous to the employees of the officers coming within the purview of this act, why then are not its coveted provisions made applicable to the other nine-tenths of the employees of this House? Why also did the employees of the House Press Gallery request on the floor of the House during the time that this bill was under consideration to be exempted from its provisions and were immediately granted their request?

The answer to this question is evident. There is no desire on the part of any of the exempted employees to come within its restrictive and depreciating provisions. I am sure that there is not one single clerk to a committee, or any other employee of the House, that is desirous of being embraced by its provisions.

While there have been many restrictions applied in the administration of this act, there have, of course, been a number of steps taken to grant relief in a number of areas. Such steps by the committee have even been more than generous in a limited number of respects where the generous advances in salary given to a limited few have certainly raised many questions as to their desirability.

This office has found that while an employee on the rolls at the time this act became effective is protected in his pay status, the classification of many responsible, highly technical positions, have been classified in a manner that it will be almost impossible for the Clerk to secure competent employees to fill such positions after the present experienced and capable employees of long service leave. This process will bring on—in fact it has already started—a deterioration in the quality of the service to the House as a result of the inability to attract persons with superior talents needed to meet the growing services of the House.

I fully recognize the right of the House of Representatives to control by law or rule any of its housekeeping activities, but I am convinced that the Committee on House Administration in reporting this measure to the House was not fully aware of its portent, nor were its hazards and limitations presented to the House at the time it was under consideration. A full exposé of this act and its implementation will convince any Member that we should repeal this act and return to the system developed by the House of Representatives in conducting its housekeeping affairs. Its implementation has demonstrated that we should return to the time-tested system which has been found desirable for nearly 200 years in the House of Representatives where there is no greater tenure than 2 years. Each House elects its Speaker and other officers and may completely change the complexion of the employment at any time it wishes. The House of Representatives is elected by the people every 2 years; it is responsive to the people, and must be able to function within itself in a manner that requires proper administration of its services.

ADDENDA

For more complete information and with the thought that it would be helpful for the Members to understand some of the conflicts brought about by the application of this law, the following table of changes is submitted. It will be observed that the position title is given, the level and step of the classification made, the present salary rate, and for comparison there follows the level and step and rate of pay that any new person being appointed to that particular position in the future would receive. Mem-

bers will appreciate that in many instances a great disparity exists between the pay of the present incumbent and the pay that the new appointee would receive. In most instances it would take the new employee 28 years to ascend to the present pay rate of the position.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, so far as the minority is concerned, this will conclude debate on this important measure. There is very little I need to add to what has been said and what is included in the report. Perhaps some emphasis should be placed on the fact this bill is overdue. We had a Presidential recommendation early in the calendar year for a pay raise.

The committee has labored long, it has had extensive hearings and executive sessions, and has now come forth with this bill. It is my understanding that some people in other branches of the Government are not entirely happy with the results that the committee has included in this bill. But as for myself, I have not seen any of the factors that gave rise to the desire for change in the bill as reported out last August. If the decisions we made in August were right then I do not know why they are not right today. The bulk of this bill other than as regards section 205 is going to have my wholehearted support.

At the time we were concluding executive sessions on the bill, the very sincere and hard-working gentleman from Arizona and myself, after defeat of one portion of the bill, talked over a vital section herein contained. I have reference to the section which deals with the pay of Cabinet officers, judges, members of the executive branch, and the Congress. The gentleman may have gotten the impression when I mentioned January 1967, I meant two raises included in this bill for October 1, 1965, and October 1, 1966, this to be added to the congressional salaries of 1967.

It was an honest misunderstanding. I meant that raises which occur subsequent to January 1967 should automatically apply to these various groups including the Congressmen.

I am going to introduce an amendment to that effect. It would mean just this exactly—that nobody sitting here would be voting themselves 1 penny of pay raise either presently or in January of 1967 and that the only pay raise that might accrue that a person here might vote for would have to come after January 1967, and would become effective then in 1969.

There is all the difference in the world between voting a pay raise and voting for an automatic increase at some later date. Why should this happen? I am entirely in sympathy with the Udall formula—a year ago when it became a part of the pay raise bill and then was eliminated by the Senate. It was a mistake in my judgment because there comes a time in these salary schedules when salaries press up against the congressional level. We are not, and properly not, going to have executives and a number of judges and so on and so forth making salaries higher than elected Members of the Congress.

Then again when we do have that as a ceiling, it presses the whole salary schedule all the way down. Then you get into those things that we got into a year ago when, in order to let the steam off and let the salary schedules go up, we were confronted with the business here of having to increase congressional salaries by \$7,500 all in one fell swoop. That is simply poor managing.

So, therefore, in entire support of the Udall section that is in this bill, I am simply going to propose that we put it off so that it does not become effective early enough to have any pay raise in this bill which might remain here for either this year or next year, accrue to any Member of the Congress elected for the term beginning January 1967.

Other than that, with a few minor changes, I find this bill very satisfactory. I hope we can pass it today. I hope we can move along and get the bill over to the Senate. I am reminded this is payday around here for our employees and it is a good day to pass a pay bill. I think also if we get on with our business we will be closer to the time when we can go home and attend to some other business.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] for stating, a few moments ago, that he intends in the next session to ask for repeal of this so-called Reclassification Act which was passed in the closing days of the last session. I also commend the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman SAM FRIEDEL, for agreeing to call his subcommittee next session and hold hearings on the unfair and shortsighted reclassification salary legislation.

That bill penalizes four legislative offices, the most important offices in our congressional legislative system. If the bill is not repealed in the early days of the next session, it will continue to cripple the departments of the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Postmaster, and the Doorkeeper.

I should like to cite an example. I believe that some super professional expert from the Civil Service Commission came up here and used some of his book learning in order to try to reorganize the legislative processes.

For example, referring to the top employees of those four legislative offices, the Reclassification Act is so written that if a present top employee dies, resigns, or retires, getting \$18,035 a year, his successor will have to drop down to \$11,000. If another employee is the next lower bracket retires who is receiving \$13,290 a year, his successor would drop down to \$10,000. Under the terms of this Reclassification Act, it will take 20 years for him to work up to a salary income of his predecessor. I hope the House of Representatives corrects this and other inequities that this act inflicts on the four legislative offices above mentioned.

I wish to commend the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing this present legislation to the floor of the House. As a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to state that you have done a good job on this present legislation, and what I have said is not a criticism of your committee regarding this deplorable Reclassification Act that was passed in the closing days of the last session.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] give me his attention for a moment?

Did I correctly understand the gentleman from Indiana to say that he appreciated the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], committing himself to a repeal of this Reclassification Act? He stated he was going to call hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. That is correct—hold hearings.

Mr. WAGGONER. I simply wished to clarify that point. I knew it was not the intent of the gentleman from Maryland to commit himself to repeal the Reclassification Act.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

I wish to take this time to express, I am sure, on behalf of so many Members of the House, our deep appreciation for the tremendous job that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has done. He has approached this legislation, as author of the bill and as chairman of the subcommittee, with a great deal of patience and a tremendous amount of personal effort, attention, and dedication. He has certainly done a magnificent job.

Likewise, I certainly wish to compliment the subcommittee and the full committee on their outstanding job in reporting and bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no further requests for time, I shall yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] a question concerning the matter which was just discussed. Last year, as I recall, legislation was approved in the House and in the Senate to set up a new arrangement for employees of the House. It was alleged to be a great step forward. His persuasiveness convinced me that it had lots of merit and was flexible enough to take care of unusual circumstances. Could the gentleman from Maryland now explain to me what impact this bill has upon that legislation which we enacted a year ago?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This bill will have no impact on that legislation. An amendment would have to be offered, and it would not be germane. I assured the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] that I would schedule hearings in the early part of January. I should like to mention that, since the

new reclassification bill went through, in 9 months we saved \$64,575.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is the gentleman from Maryland still convinced that that legislation is desirable and is working well at the present time?

Mr. FRIEDEL. So far, I think so. I have not heard any complaints about it. But we will get into it in the early part of next year.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope this House, restricting its provisions, as originally intended, to career employees, will very soon approve this bill before us, H.R. 10281, the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965.

The fundamental objective of this measure is to make such reasonable adjustments in current Federal salary rates as will bring them more into line with the salaries paid in private enterprise for the same levels and types of work.

I urge House approval of this objective not only because it is in full accord with accepted economic principles and modern business practices, but also because such approval will be a fulfillment of our congressional pledge and a rightful implementation of the recommendations made by two great Presidents of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of the Federal civilian salary adjustments provided for in this bill is essential to give full faith and credit to the principles and policy of comparability of Federal and private enterprise salaries established by the two previous Congresses.

The record will show that when this comparability principle was first established by the 87th Congress, its enactment inspired a most wholesome climate of labor-management cooperation never before attained in the Government. The principle was applauded by management, endorsed by the public, and universally recognized as an entirely solid and valid concept which would equitably meet and satisfy the needs of both management and workers. However and unfortunately, the record and the statistics demonstrate, despite the 3-year period in which the comparability policy has been recognized, not a single Federal salary has yet been brought to a close approximation of full and current comparability with the same position in private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Federal and postal employees of our Government, at all levels, have a history of superior duty performance and loyalty to this country and I believe that it is not only economically right but, in a larger sense, it is in the best national interest to reasonably preserve and encourage their high morale and dedication. It is my additional belief that passage of this legislation will, indeed, serve as a most prudent inducement for recruitment, now and in the future, of the most desirable individuals for career postal and Federal service.

Mr. Chairman, because approval of this bill will accomplish the objectives I have outlined, which are undoubtedly in the greater public interest, and because it will be, at the same time, an extension of fair and just treatment to our faithful Federal employees in compari-

son with those of similar responsibilities in private industry, I urge the adoption of H.R. 10281.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, H.R. 10281, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, deserves the full support of this Congress. It is no mystery that a gap exists between Federal and private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work. This fact was clearly established through extensive congressional committee hearings when the comparability principle for Federal salaries was first developed and officially recommended by President Kennedy 4 years ago. Congress did not turn its back toward the Federal civilian employees but realistically pledged itself to adjust the inequities that existed with the enactment of Public Law 87-793 and further implemented by Public Law 88-426. A pledge that can be further fulfilled with the approval of this legislation.

Federal career employees are a dedicated group of people who take pride in their work in the administration of the varied functions of the Federal Government. But dedication cannot pay the rent, supply bodily nourishment, nor purchase needed clothing for these workers and their families. To meet these obligations one must be compensated to cope with economic changes that are established by private enterprise which controls the price structure of the goods consumed. As President Johnson declared in his message to Congress:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted. In the long run, it costs more.

Under the major provisions of H.R. 10281 the principle of comparability is reaffirmed. Its chief goal provides for two separate salary adjustments, one to take effect October 1, 1965, and the second to become effective a year later. These adjustments will benefit employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949; employees in the postal field service; certain Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery personnel, Foreign Service officers and staff officers and employees, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committee employees, legislative employees, and employees in the judicial branch.

The legislation improves Federal employees' overtime and holiday pay provisions in order to bring them closer to provisions of the kind widely accepted in modern, progressive private enterprise. This section particularly aids employees in the postal field service who have labored for years under an inequitable system in the field of overtime work and overtime pay; work on Saturday and Sunday and holidays. This adjustment is long overdue.

The bill takes into consideration the deficiency of reasonable severance pay allowances to Federal employees who are separated from the service through no fault of their own and who have not yet become eligible for immediate civil serv-

ice retirement benefits. Section 112 of the bill adjusts this inequity by providing fair payment to the affected employee with special consideration given to the age of the individual who is asked to leave the service.

One other important section of the bill increases maximum authorized uniform allowance from \$100 to \$150 to Federal employees required to wear uniforms. This is the first such increase in uniform allowance in 11 years and it is greatly needed, especially to the postal employees in the lower salary levels who face increased costs in procuring their uniforms.

The legislation also adjusts other unfair conditions in the postal field service. Postal seniority salary adjustments recognizes the length of honorable service by an employee promoted from one level to another. Section 108 remedies a hardship faced by many postal employees in meeting the costs of relocation when they are assigned to new positions far removed from their present duty posts. With the many operational changes now taking place in the Post Office Department, such moves are not uncommon and the employee faces heavy added personal expenses in making a move.

Careful analysis of the legislation clearly indicates the justification of its enactment. Not only will it achieve adequate, up-to-date, and fair pay systems for Government personnel, but it will enable the Government to attract and retain in Federal service the best talent in America. With top-grade talent we can expect efficient operation.

I strongly recommend that this bill be passed as reported and urge approval by the Members of this House.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act, which proposes to honor pledges by the Congress to effect comparability of pay between private enterprise and the Federal Government for the same levels of work. I trust this measure will expeditiously be approved by the Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the 87th Congress when Public Law 87-793 was enacted. That law was designed to provide Federal salaries comparable to salaries in private enterprise, but we have not provided salaries in keeping with the intent of that law. The bill before us today is a step in that direction, but it falls short of the goal. Admittedly, H.R. 10281 is a compromise bill, and I believe that there should be no further compromise.

This bill provides long overdue improvements in our Federal employees' overtime and holiday pay provisions. Our postal workers have long suffered inequities in this area. Substitutes work many hours of overtime on a highly irregular schedule and receive no overtime—postal employees work Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays without any premium rates for same. H.R. 10281 cor-

rects this situation and brings it into comparability with non-Federal salaries.

Mr. Chairman, a very important provision in H.R. 10281 is the provision for reasonable severance pay for Federal employees who lose their employment through no fault of their own and who are not eligible for immediate civil service retirement. This need has been very pointedly brought to the attention of a great many of us with the many cutbacks in Federal employment in some areas. The Defense Department's cutbacks have hit my district and the entire New York City metropolitan area with a very heavy impact. We have entirely too many instances of family men who have given many years of faithful service to our Government losing their jobs, too young for retirement and with children, who have no immediate entitlement to benefits to cushion the impact until they can find employment. We all know the difficulties that a man in his late thirties and forties encounters when he must start anew in employment.

The uniform allowance of up to \$100 yearly for those required to wear uniforms, usually employees in the lower salary levels, was enacted 11 years ago and there has been no change since. I am sure that we all realize that this figure is no longer realistic, and the modest increase to \$150 per year is more than justified.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the bill before us is a modest one. Our loyal, hard-working postal and Federal employees deserve this recognition.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10281 without any further crippling amendments.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, since the pay raise for Federal employees was first proposed, I have been strongly in favor of it. I have been against the compromises reducing the amount of the pay raise. I am strongly opposed to any efforts made in the House to now reduce the proposed pay raise. It is meritorious and must be granted if our Federal employees are to be kept abreast of the purchasing power of the dollar, which we all know has deteriorated since the last pay adjustment.

My only reservation has been that I feel strongly that there should be no congressional pay raise attached to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure on my part to continue to support with all my strength this raise.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of salary adjustments for our Government personnel, and have expressed my support for a salary increase for our Federal employees a number of times. But in light of the fact that a pay increase for Members of Congress was granted last year, I do not favor another raise starting in January of 1967.

I am for the amendment to H.R. 10281, the amendment will delete the section dealing with the pay raise for Members of Congress.

The amendment would in no way keep our Federal employees from receiving their well-deserved pay raise. It will affect only Members of Congress, who I

feel at this point are not justified in asking for a raise in salary.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the pending proposal to raise the salaries of Federal employees. Perhaps never before has the need for well-trained, intelligent, and alert civil servants been as fully explored and as widely admitted as today. Those men and women whose responsibility it is to administer the domestic and international policies of our Nation have assumed unparalleled significance. Yet these individuals, who have taken on greater responsibility and an increased workload, have had to be satisfied with a salary which continues to fall farther and farther behind that paid by private industry for comparable work.

In the past, legislation to raise Federal salaries has not been notably consistent or well thought out. Instead, it has been developed in a more or less haphazard fashion. Typically it has brought too little, too late.

In 1962 we wrote into the Salary Reform Act an important and constructive principle which was to serve as a guide for determining the appropriate level of Federal salaries. This principle of comparability provides an equitable and systematic yardstick by which to determine amount and timing for Federal pay raises.

On the basis of this principle, President Kennedy recommended that the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Civil Service Commission draw up a scale comparing the increased Federal salaries with those of private industry for similar levels of work.

The President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries reported on April 15, 1965, that in private enterprise salaries had increased by 3 percent in the year ending March 1964. A similar rise was predicted for the entire fiscal year 1965. On the basis of this report, the President submitted to Congress in his message of May 12, 1965, a request for pay increases.

In reporting out H.R. 10281, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service noted that the comparability principle had been recommended by President Kennedy and enacted into law 3 years ago. Since then, unfortunately, not a single Federal salary had been brought to even a close approximation of full and current comparability with its opposite number in private enterprise.

To allow another year to elapse without acting on this principle would be unfair to the individual Government employees and detrimental to the Government as a whole.

Government employees are having to shoulder an increasing workload each year. For example, the Postmaster General pointed out that six times as many postal employees are now handling 13 times as much mail as in 1890. The number of postal employees has increased by 59 percent since 1940, but the volume of mail has gone up by 128 percent. The postal employees themselves are primarily responsible for this great improvement in productivity and efficiency. As a reward, the postal employee is forced to make ends meet on a salary substan-

tially below that which his services could command if he were employed by private industry. Clearly, these fine men deserve increased pay, extra compensation for work performed in excess of 8 hours a day, and work on Sundays.

In addition to the financial problem, this is a morale-shattering situation. The average Government employee can do little about his situation. He must depend upon Congress to look after his interests and to assure him just treatment. Congress has too often failed to do this in the past. This is an obligation which Congress must face now and deal with honestly, fairly, and promptly. It is essential that Congress honor its pledge before this session adjourns.

And we must be concerned not only with the rights and needs of the individual employee, but with the good of the Government and the Nation as a whole. To place the Government as an employer at a continuous disadvantage comparatively to private enterprise is to pursue a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy. Not only has the workload expanded as a result of the postwar population boom and the cold-war defense demands, but problems of greater complexity and scope have exerted strong pressures for specialized and improved governmental services.

Trained and capable experts are essential if the Government is to maintain the high level of efficiency and competence necessary to stay abreast of the times. These experts are in great demand in both Government and private industry. All too often the Government takes second choice or loses out completely because it cannot compete on the labor market by offering lower wages and fewer fringe benefits. Key positions have remained vacant for long periods.

This not only is inefficient in that it wastes the taxpayers' money, but it will also seriously hamper our ability domestically and internationally to achieve wise and efficient policy. The pace of the sixties is such that the loss of talent and efficiency will substantially reduce our ability to complete successfully the domestic reforms needed, will seriously jeopardize our efforts to maintain leadership in international relations.

Obviously, this situation cannot be allowed to continue. Legislation must be enacted as soon as possible that will enable the Federal Government to compete reasonably with business for a fair share of the Nation's talent. The enactment of H.R. 10281 would help redress this situation by raising Federal salaries and closing the gap separating Federal salaries from those paid by private industry.

H.R. 10281 also attempts to bring Government into closer approximation with private industry in terms of other benefits. To take one example, this bill includes a provision setting up a system of severance pay for Federal employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. The unfortunate closing of shipyards produced many such cases. Severance pay to these employees would equal the sum of 1 week's pay for each year of service beyond 10 years, plus 10 percent of the basic severance allowance for each year the employee was over

age 40. This provision supports the criteria of loyalty, service, and need by rewarding experience while giving added aid to older workers who are most likely to have difficulty finding reemployment. Further payments would terminate immediately in the event that an individual is reemployed by the Government during a period covered by severance pay.

The competence of our civil service surpasses that of any other nation. The Federal Government cannot long maintain this standard if it is forced to compete at an increasing disadvantage. Furthermore, it is only fair and proper that all Federal employees—from messengers to administrators—should be rewarded not only with words, but with adequate and comparable salaries as well. Thus, to fulfill our pledge to the Federal employees, to insure the greatest efficiency and competency in our Government, and, in the long run, to save the taxpayers' money, I urge the prompt enactment of H.R. 10281.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of legislation to increase the wages of the many underpaid postal and other Federal employees. I am well aware that generally, the wages of these people fall short of comparable positions in private business. And I also join my colleagues who say the congressional salary is not enough and I could certainly use an additional 4½ percent. But I must oppose any measure to increase congressional and judicial salaries at this time.

This past weekend I had the opportunity of serving as minority House Member at the hearings in New Orleans and Baton Rouge on the devastation of Hurricane Betsy. You cannot imagine until you see and hear firsthand the number of people left homeless by this hurricane.

The point I wish to make is this: The majority of these people presently have no legal means of getting Federal assistance to meet their personal needs. These are low-income people who in many cases cannot meet the requirements for small business or other Federal loans.

I cannot sit here and vote myself a pay increase even though it would be a great deal of help in meeting the expenses of being a Congressman, while I know that there are those in Louisiana and Mississippi who are in critical need of financial help and cannot get it.

I urge my colleagues, before you vote yourselves this increase, consider those people, not just in Mississippi and Louisiana, but all over the country who need this money. Let us not vote to increase our own salaries, when there are so many with a much greater need than ours.

With this problem resolved, we can then go on to pass the provisions giving the Federal employees, who really do need a pay increase, their ample compensation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. This legislation will adjust the rates of basic compensation of Federal employees

and establish the Federal Salary Review Commission.

By supporting this bill we honor the pledges made by the Congress, and two Presidents, our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and President Lyndon Johnson, that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those paid by private enterprise for the same levels of work. I have long supported the principle of comparability in determining pay for employees of the Government. In my opinion, the only fair and accurate system to be used in determining what Federal employees should be paid is to pay them on the same basis as those employed in outside industry.

I am pleased that this legislation also achieves a major breakthrough in the improvement of Federal employees' overtime and holiday pay provisions in order to bring them closer to provisions of the kind widely accepted in modern, progressive private enterprise. Substitute employees, who perform a great deal of postal work, receive only straight hourly rate pay despite the length or the irregularity of their daily and weekly duty assignments, or whether they work on Saturday and Sunday. This unjust situation is corrected in this bill, which establishes fair, moderate, and workable premium pay requirements for overtime and holiday work.

Mr. Chairman, another serious deficiency in Federal employee benefits is corrected by provisions of the bill granting fair and reasonable severance pay allowances to Federal employees who are separated from the service through no fault of their own and have not yet become eligible for immediate civil service benefits. This bill also raises the maximum authorized uniform allowance by \$50, from \$100 established 11 years ago, to \$150 per year, thus reflecting the cost of living and increasing cost of uniforms during that period.

I am also particularly interested in one provision of the bill establishing a needed remedy for a serious gap in postal personnel statutes, which already is imposing hardship on my postal employees. It is the provision for relocation expenses payment, a practice made in private industry. As a result of the transition of the postal transportation and distribution operations to the new "sectional center" system, and the further aggravations caused by moving into the ZIP code and distribution plan, many postal employees have suffered, or in the near future will encounter severe disruptions of their lives accompanied by heavy added personal expenses when they are assigned to new positions away from their present duty posts. This bill provides for a per diem allowance for each member of the family of a postal employee while traveling to a new duty station, and subsistence expenses for himself and his family for up to 30 days while they occupy temporary quarters at the place of his new official station. In addition, the employee will be granted 7 days of leave with pay not charged to his annual leave.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10281, the Federal

Salary Adjustment Act of 1965. This bill will give a 4½-percent salary increase to Federal employees, effective October 1, 1965, and a further increase, based on the comparability provisions of the bill, a year later.

Mr. Chairman, since coming to Congress I have supported and worked for equitable pay increases and other legislation in the interest and welfare of our postal and classified Federal workers. If we are to have a high level of efficiency in our Government service, and if we are to retain loyal and dedicated workers and maintain their morale, we must provide adequate pay and fair and equitable work standards.

There are many Federal employees in my congressional district, and especially post office workers, and I know personally that a large percentage of them are forced to hold extra jobs in order to maintain a decent standard of living for their families.

The pay increase offered in this bill is greatly needed. The Federal pay bill of 1962 included a pledge by Congress to grant a true comparability with private industry. Postal and classified salaries are lagging 6 percent behind comparable rates for private industry. I had introduced a 7-percent pay increase bill and testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for my bill and similar bills for a larger increase. I am disappointed the increase provided in this bill before us is not greater and more in keeping with the present day cost of living.

H.R. 10281 makes needed improvements in the overtime and holiday pay provisions of Federal employees and brings them closer to provisions accepted in private industry. In addition to overtime pay adjustments, a new and just concept of severance pay is provided, with reasonable compensation to assist Federal employees over difficult transition periods when they are separated from Government service through no fault of their own. The bill establishes a standard 5-day, Monday to Friday workweek for postal employees and it also corrects present transitional inequities between senior and junior employees. Postal employees will receive additional relocation compensation when transferred from one station to another.

I am pleased that the bill sets up a Federal Salary Review Commission, which I had proposed in my own bill.

I have taken the time to mention only some of the major provisions of H.R. 10281. I urge my colleagues in the House to vote with me for passage of this legislation, which will go a long way toward improving the working and living conditions of our thousands of Federal workers.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, recognizing that compensation comparability for Federal employees is essential if we are to maintain a high-quality career civil service, I am pleased to announce my support of H.R. 10281.

The provisions of this bill, with the single exception of more money for Members of Congress—and I shall vote to reject that section, are sound and in

keeping with our congressional commitment to adequate pay for the men and women who are the fiber of our National Government.

Too often the popular view of pay legislation benefiting Federal employees is that it is just another pay raise for the civil servants. But, quite frequently what we do in this regard makes the difference between the country's keeping in its employ those with the training, ability, and motivation to properly administer important Government responsibilities or causing them to become disenchanted with Federal service because of inadequate remuneration and deciding to find work in the private sector. When this happens, it not only is a personal loss but it also represents a considerable cost to the taxpayer because of the expense in finding a new employee and then equipping him to discharge the duties of the post.

Therefore, I always include in my examination of the arithmetic involved in pay legislation the very pertinent factor of what it will cost us, as a nation, should we fail to structure the salaries of Federal employees on a basis comparable to that of private enterprise.

Anyone who is personally acquainted with the people who serve this country as employees of the Federal agencies, departments, bureaus, and so on knows the good fortune which is America's by virtue of the tremendous dedication, integrity, and willingness to sacrifice which these people possess. The postal clerks and carriers, the men and women in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, social security offices, Small Business Administration, and throughout the executive branch of Government are patriots in their own right. They love their country, find pleasure in working for its betterment, encourage others in their families to join the civil service, and in hundreds of other ways do their utmost to assure the operation of an economical and efficient Government.

For their loyalty, I believe we must assure that Federal pay scales are kept at a level comparable with what they easily could earn in non-Federal employment. That opportunity is now at hand in H.R. 10281, and I conclude my remarks by repeating my intention to vote for its passage.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the 1st session of the 89th Congress must not adjourn without acting on the most important item of Federal personnel legislation that has been introduced this year.

I am, of course, referring to H.R. 10281, the Federal pay raise bill. Actually, this legislation is much more than just a pay bill. It would enact into law several new policies regarding Federal compensation that would move us a long step closer to the goal we all want—making the Federal Government a model employer.

Among the most important of these innovations are the idea of severance pay for employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own before they are eligible for retirement benefits and the creation of a Federal Salary Review Commission.

The tasks of this Commission would be, first, to review congressional, judicial,

and Federal executive salaries with the idea of sustaining them at an equitable level and in an appropriate relationship to pay rates under the Classification Act. Second, a major function of the Commission would be to review the structures, principles, and interrelationships of the statutory salary systems under which Federal employees are paid.

It would be on the basis of the Commission's findings and reports that the President would make his salary recommendations to Congress.

The primary purpose of this legislation, in the words of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee report accompanying the bill, is "to honor—through moderate but timely and meaningful salary adjustments—the pledges made by the committee, by the Congress, and by two Presidents of the United States that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those paid by private enterprise for the same levels of work."

The comparability principle, one of the most enlightened statements of congressional pay policy ever written into Federal law, was incorporated in the 1962 pay law. It is, however, just a statement of policy. Pay adjustments to assure comparability are not made automatically. The economic data are provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but Congress must still enact legislation to put the raises into effect.

Complete comparability between Federal compensation and salaries in the private economy has proved an elusive goal. We moved toward it with a two-phase increase in the 1962 pay law, the second increment becoming effective in January 1964, and with the pay law enacted in August 1964.

Nevertheless, statistics on the economy and other indicators leave no doubt that our classified and postal employees are still not receiving salaries commensurate with those being paid by business and industry for work of approximately the same level of difficulty and responsibility.

As President Johnson said in his pay message of May 12, 1965:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted in the long run, it costs more.

If we are to continue to work toward the removal of this double standard, if we are to assure classified and postal employees of the income they need and deserve for the services they render, we must enact H.R. 10281 into law.

This bill, like the 1962 pay law, calls for two salary adjustments. The first would become effective this October; the second, about a year from now. Its passage would bring virtually complete comparability to the lower Federal and postal salaries, whereas pay for middle and upper levels would relate to private enterprise rates of a year or 18 months ago.

This may not be perfection, but certainly it is progress.

In addition to pay raises, severance pay, and the Federal Salary Review Com-

mission, the bill would make other substantial improvements in personnel management. For classified employees it would, just to mention two points, permit appeal from unfavorable "acceptable level of competence" rulings and establish a more liberal overtime pay schedule.

For postal workers certain inequities that have arisen in regard to seniority would be straightened out, overtime and holiday pay provisions would be modernized, and relocation and uniform allowances would be liberalized.

The responsibility for the welfare and just treatment of every employee of the Federal Government rests squarely on Congress. H.R. 10281 is a good bill, and by passing it, Congress will have discharged this responsibility.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of the pending pay bill covering postal and classified employees of the Government and other Federal employees.

The principle of comparability proposed by this legislation is, I think, of great importance in insuring equity and justice to all those who are employed by the Federal Government.

Over a period of years, as the committee has so well pointed out, I think there has been a considerable lag in bringing Government pay scales and standards up to those obtaining in private industry.

In an important sense this situation is probably the reverse of what it should be, in that the Government should be expected to furnish a good example for industry and other segments of the national economy in fixing pay, wages, and salaries.

In the adjustment of pay scales in any event, I think that, on the basis of the comparability principle or otherwise, the Congress must make sure that, while fairness, equity, and justice prevail the interests of the Government and the taxpayers should also be kept in mind.

The Government has the right to expect from its employees, loyal, faithful, adequate service for compensation received, and the Government can ill afford to follow practices in paying employees for work that they do not perform adequately or well.

The committee has striven hard and commendably, I believe, to try to bring the pay of Cabinet officers, Government executives, judges, and Members of Congress within the comparability principle.

The application of this principle is particularly desirable today, when the executive department is having so much trouble getting qualified executives to perform at high levels the necessary work of Government agencies. There is no doubt but that at these levels the pay scales of private corporations and business in this country have run well ahead of Government pay scales for similar services and, of course, there is need for some readjustment.

The value and urgency of adequate pay for the Federal judiciary is also incontrovertible.

The plan adopted by the able and distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr.

UDALL and his committee, for comparability pay in these categories has merit.

While I am opposed to raising congressional salaries at this time, or at any other future time, unless the Congress itself shall have an opportunity to vote expressly upon appropriation items that involve such proposed increases, I believe that the principle of comparability utilized and revised so well by the committee, should, in time, be made applicable to all Government employees, including Cabinet officers, high officials of the executive department, judges, and Members of Congress.

As I stated above, insofar as Members of Congress are concerned, we can and should be able as well to deal with any proposed increases affecting our own membership on the merits, as we have done before, and we must do this with reference to specific appropriation bills that will give us an opportunity to pass upon these matters individually and preferably by a record vote.

I want to make my position clear on this matter because I feel strongly that

the plan of the committee to apply the comparability principle to Government employment has been carefully thought out by the committee and has real merit.

Members of Congress may invoke their own discretion to vote on individual appropriation bills, as they should, whenever salary raises for Members of Congress are proposed. It should be pointed out that Members of Congress will have that opportunity under this bill. I oppose congressional salary increases now.

The bill, as proposed, will be costly, as will these measures, but the Government must expect to pay its faithful, loyal, capable employees well, and it must expect to pay them on a comparable basis with the compensation and salary scales existing in private industry. That is the least the Congress can do.

I believe this bill seeks to recognize the very many devoted public servants who are honestly discharging their responsibilities to the Government and making fine contributions of efficient service they are rendering our citizens and our Government.

Let me commend the committee for its excellent work on this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965".

TITLE I

Short title

SECTION 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965".

Employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 400; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Except as provided in section 111(b) of the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, the compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	\$3,538	\$3,658	\$3,778	\$3,898	\$4,018	\$4,138	\$4,258	\$4,378	\$4,498	\$4,618
GS-2	3,848	3,974	4,105	4,236	4,367	4,498	4,629	4,760	4,891	5,022
GS-3	4,185	4,326	4,467	4,608	4,749	4,890	5,031	5,172	5,313	5,454
GS-4	4,680	4,837	4,994	5,151	5,308	5,465	5,622	5,779	5,936	6,093
GS-5	5,230	5,402	5,574	5,746	5,918	6,090	6,262	6,434	6,606	6,778
GS-6	5,755	5,948	6,141	6,334	6,527	6,720	6,913	7,106	7,299	7,492
GS-7	6,322	6,531	6,740	6,949	7,158	7,367	7,576	7,785	7,994	8,203
GS-8	6,927	7,157	7,387	7,617	7,847	8,077	8,307	8,537	8,767	8,997
GS-9	7,545	7,801	8,057	8,313	8,569	8,825	9,081	9,337	9,593	9,849
GS-10	8,256	8,538	8,820	9,102	9,384	9,666	9,948	10,230	10,512	10,794
GS-11	9,040	9,348	9,656	9,964	10,272	10,580	10,888	11,196	11,504	11,812
GS-12	10,711	11,082	11,453	11,824	12,195	12,566	12,937	13,308	13,679	14,050
GS-13	12,618	13,057	13,496	13,935	14,374	14,813	15,252	15,691	16,130	16,569
GS-14	14,808	15,320	15,832	16,344	16,856	17,368	17,880	18,392	18,904	19,416
GS-15	17,200	17,796	18,392	18,988	19,584	20,180	20,776	21,372	21,968	22,564
GS-16	19,790	20,474	21,158	21,842	22,526	23,210	23,894	24,578	25,262	25,946
GS-17	22,410	23,194	23,978	24,762	25,546					
GS-18	25,602									

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule sets forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b)

of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

Redeterminations of acceptable levels of competence

SEC. 103. Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Whenever a determination is made under subsection (a) of this section that the work of an officer or employee is not of an acceptable level of competence, he shall promptly be given written notice of the determination and an opportunity to secure a reconsideration of the determination within his department, under fair and equitable

procedures which shall be established by the Commission. If the reconsideration results in a determination that the work of such officer or employee had been of an acceptable level of competence, the new determination shall supersede the earlier determination and shall be deemed to have been made as of the date of the earlier determination. If the earlier determination is affirmed by his department, the employee shall have the right of appeal to the Commission. The Commission shall review such number of reconsideration decisions of the departments to enable the Commission to determine whether they are being made in a fair and equitable manner."

Overtime compensation

SEC. 104. (a) Sections 201 and 202 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1109; 5 U.S.C. 911 and 912), are each amended by striking out "grade GS-9" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS-10".

(b) Section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1109; 5 U.S.C. 911), is amended by striking out "All hours of work officially ordered or approved in excess of forty hours in any administrative workweek" and inserting in lieu thereof "All hours of work officially ordered or approved in excess of eight hours per day or in excess of forty hours in any administrative workweek".

(c) Section 204 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U.S.C. 912b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "To the maximum extent practicable, the head of

any department, independent establishment, or agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the head of any legislative or judicial agency to which this title applies, shall schedule the time to be spent by an officer or employee in a travel status away from his official duty

station within the regularly scheduled work-week of such officer or employee."

Postal field service employees

SEC. 105. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal

field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in section 111(b) of the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965 and in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"Postal Field Service Schedule"

"PFS"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.....	\$4,120	\$4,256	\$4,392	\$4,528	\$4,664	\$4,800	\$4,936	\$5,072	\$5,208	\$5,344	\$5,480	\$5,616
2.....	4,465	4,611	4,757	4,903	5,049	5,195	5,341	5,487	5,633	5,779	5,925	6,071
3.....	4,822	4,984	5,146	5,308	5,470	5,632	5,794	5,956	6,118	6,280	6,442	6,604
4.....	5,230	5,402	5,574	5,746	5,918	6,090	6,262	6,434	6,606	6,778	6,950	7,122
5.....	5,585	5,773	5,961	6,149	6,337	6,525	6,713	6,901	7,089	7,277	7,465	7,653
6.....	5,990	6,189	6,388	6,587	6,786	6,985	7,184	7,383	7,582	7,781	7,980	8,179
7.....	6,418	6,632	6,846	7,060	7,274	7,488	7,702	7,916	8,130	8,344	8,558	
8.....	6,949	7,179	7,409	7,639	7,869	8,099	8,329	8,559	8,789	9,019		
9.....	7,511	7,762	8,013	8,264	8,515	8,766	9,017	9,268	9,519	9,770		
10.....	8,181	8,458	8,735	9,012	9,289	9,566	9,843	10,120	10,397	10,674		
11.....	9,040	9,348	9,656	9,964	10,272	10,580	10,888	11,196	11,504	11,812		
12.....	10,000	10,340	10,680	11,020	11,360	11,700	12,040	12,380	12,720	13,060		
13.....	11,052	11,433	11,814	12,195	12,576	12,957	13,338	13,719	14,100	14,481		
14.....	12,185	12,608	13,031	13,454	13,877	14,300	14,723	15,146	15,569	15,992		
15.....	13,465	13,930	14,395	14,860	15,325	15,790	16,255	16,720	17,185	17,650		
16.....	14,882	15,399	15,916	16,433	16,950	17,467	17,984	18,501	19,018	19,535		
17.....	16,463	17,038	17,613	18,188	18,763	19,338	19,913	20,488	21,063	21,638		
18.....	18,240	18,877	19,514	20,151	20,788	21,425	22,062	22,699	23,336	23,973		
19.....	20,215	20,920	21,625	22,330	23,035	23,740	24,445	25,150				
20.....	22,410	23,194	23,978	24,762	25,546							

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known

as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Except as provided in section 111(b) of the Federal Sal-

ary Adjustment Act of 1965, compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"Rural carrier schedule"

	"Per annum rates and steps"											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service; fixed compensation per annum.....	\$2,350	\$2,462	\$2,574	\$2,686	\$2,798	\$2,910	\$3,022	\$3,134	\$3,246	\$3,358	\$3,470	\$3,582
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25"

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which

the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Except as provided in section 111(b) of the Federal

Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"Fourth class office schedule"

"Revenue units"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36.....	\$3,936	\$4,067	\$4,198	\$4,329	\$4,460	\$4,591	\$4,722	\$4,853	\$4,984	\$5,115	\$5,246	\$5,377
24 but less than 30.....	3,043	3,163	3,283	3,403	3,523	3,643	3,763	3,883	3,999	4,119	4,239	4,359
18 but less than 24.....	3,009	3,110	3,211	3,312	3,413	3,514	3,615	3,716	3,817	3,918	4,019	4,120
12 but less than 18.....	2,360	2,436	2,512	2,588	2,664	2,740	2,816	2,892	2,968	3,044	3,120	3,196
6 but less than 12.....	1,701	1,755	1,809	1,863	1,917	1,971	2,025	2,079	2,133	2,187	2,241	2,295
Less than 6.....	1,372	1,416	1,460	1,504	1,548	1,592	1,636	1,680	1,724	1,768	1,812	1,856"

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this title, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in

the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Postal seniority salary adjustments

SEC. 106. Section 3552(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Postmaster General shall advance any employee in the postal field service who—

"(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

"(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in the same post office promoted to the same level on or after

October 13, 1962, and is in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee. Such advancement by the Postmaster General shall be to the highest step which is held by any such junior employee. Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained."

Postal service overtime and holiday compensation

SEC. 107. (a) Section 3571 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3571. Maximum hours of work

"Employees may not be required to work more than twelve hours a day except for

emergencies as determined by the Postmaster General. The work schedule of an annual rate or hourly rate regular employee shall be regulated so that the eight hours of scheduled service does not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours. The work span of any other employee shall not extend over a longer period than twelve consecutive hours. A basic workweek is established for all postal field service employees, consisting of five eight-hour days excluding Saturday and Sunday. To provide service on days other than those included in the basic workweek, the Postmaster General shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week. To the maximum extent possible, senior annual rate regular employees shall be assigned to the basic workweek, except for any such senior annual rate regular employee who expresses a preference for a workweek other than the basic workweek."

(b) Section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3573. Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays

"(a) In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to perform overtime work or to work on holidays. Overtime work is any work officially ordered or approved which is performed by—

"(1) an annual rate regular employee in excess of his regular work schedule or on a Sunday,

"(2) an hourly rate regular employee (A) in excess of eight hours in a day, (B) in excess of forty hours in a week, or (C) on a Sunday, and

"(3) a substitute employee (A) in excess of eight hours a day or (B) in excess of forty hours a week.

"(b) For each hour of overtime work, an employee in the PFS schedule shall be compensated as follows:

"(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-10 shall be paid at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

"(2) Each employee in or above salary level PFS-11 shall be granted compensatory time equal to the overtime work, or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be paid at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation of the employee or of the hourly rate of the basic compensation for the highest step rate of salary level PFS-10, whichever is the lesser.

"(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1951 (55 Stat. 862; 5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall be paid, in lieu of all other compensation, as follows:

"(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-10 shall be paid at the rate of 200 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

"(2) Each employee in or above salary level PFS-11 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be compensated for the time so worked at the rate of 200 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, for work performed on Christmas Day, each employee shall be paid at the rate of 250 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall establish conditions for the use of compensatory time earned and the payment of compensation for unused compensatory time.

"(e) If an employee is entitled under this section to unused compensatory time at the time of his death, the Postmaster General shall pay at the rate prescribed in this section, but not less than a sum equal to the employee's hourly basic compensation, for each hour of such unused compensatory time to the person or persons surviving at the date of such employee's death. Such payment shall be made in the order of precedence prescribed in the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f), and shall be a bar to recovery by any other persons of amounts so paid.

"(f) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, other than subsection (e), no employee shall be paid overtime or holiday compensation for a pay period which when added to his basic compensation for the pay period exceeds one twenty-sixth of the annual rate of basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-17.

"(g) For the purposes of this section and section 3571 of this title—

"(1) 'annual rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of five eight-hour days in accordance with section 3571 of this title;

"(2) 'hourly rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of not more than forty hours a week; and

"(3) 'substitute employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has not established a regular work schedule."

(c) Section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3575. Exemptions

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573, and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary level PFS-15 and above.

"(b) Sections 3571 and 3573 of this title do not apply to employees referred to in section 3581 of this title.

"(c) Section 3571 of this title does not apply to employees in post offices of the third class."

Postal employees relocation expenses

Sec. 108. (a) That part of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, which precedes the center heading "Special Classes of Employees" and section 3111 thereof, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3107. Postal employees relocation expenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee in the postal field service who is transferred or relocated from one official station to another shall, under regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General, be granted the following allowances and expenses:

"(1) Per diem allowance, in lieu of subsistence expenses, for each member of his immediate family, while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(2) Subsistence expenses of the employee and each member of his immediate family for a period of not to exceed thirty days while occupying temporary quarters at the place of his new official duty station, but not in excess

of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) Seven days of leave with pay which shall not be charged to any other leave to which he is entitled under existing law."

(b) That part of the table of contents of such chapter 41 under the heading "Employees Generally" is amended by inserting "3107. Postal employees relocation expenses." immediately below

"3106. Special compensation rules."

Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

Sec. 109. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) Except as provided in section 111(b) of the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, the per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"Section 4103 Schedule

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, \$25,602.
"Medical Director, \$22,410 minimum to \$25,545 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, \$17,200 minimum to \$22,564 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, \$17,200 minimum to \$22,564 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, \$17,200 minimum to \$22,564 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, \$17,200 minimum to \$22,564 maximum.

"(b) (1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"Physician and dentist schedule

"Director grade, \$19,790 minimum to \$25,262 maximum.

"Executive grade, \$18,449 minimum to \$24,234 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$17,200 minimum to \$22,564 maximum.

"Senior grade \$14,808 minimum to \$19,416 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$12,618 minimum to \$16,569 maximum.

"Full grade, \$10,711 minimum to \$14,050 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$9,040 minimum to \$11,812 maximum.

"Nurse schedule

"Assistant Director grade, \$14,808 minimum to \$19,416 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$12,618 minimum to \$16,569 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$10,711 minimum to \$14,050 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,040 minimum to \$11,812 maximum.

"Full grade, \$7,545 minimum to \$9,849 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,600 minimum to \$8,575 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$5,755 minimum to \$7,492 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

Sec. 110. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as

amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in section

111(b) of the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, the per annum salaries of Foreign

Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1.....	\$23,670	\$24,636	\$25,602				
Class 2.....	19,117	19,781	20,445	\$21,109	\$21,773	\$22,437	\$23,101
Class 3.....	15,530	16,068	16,606	17,144	17,682	18,220	18,758
Class 4.....	12,618	13,057	13,496	13,935	14,374	14,813	15,252
Class 5.....	10,395	10,755	11,115	11,475	11,835	12,195	12,555
Class 6.....	8,698	8,966	9,264	9,562	9,860	10,158	10,456
Class 7.....	7,324	7,570	7,816	8,062	8,308	8,554	8,800
Class 8.....	6,322	6,531	6,740	6,949	7,158	7,367	7,576

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "Except as

provided in section 111(b) of the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, the per an-

num salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1.....	\$15,530	\$16,068	\$16,606	\$17,144	\$17,682	\$18,220	\$18,758	\$19,296	\$19,834	\$20,372
Class 2.....	12,618	13,057	13,496	13,935	14,374	14,813	15,252	15,691	16,130	16,569
Class 3.....	10,395	10,755	11,115	11,475	11,835	12,195	12,555	12,915	13,275	13,635
Class 4.....	8,698	8,966	9,264	9,562	9,860	10,158	10,456	10,754	11,052	11,350
Class 5.....	7,814	8,081	8,348	8,615	8,882	9,149	9,416	9,683	9,950	10,217
Class 6.....	7,060	7,295	7,530	7,765	8,000	8,235	8,470	8,705	8,940	9,175
Class 7.....	6,484	6,698	6,912	7,126	7,340	7,554	7,768	7,982	8,196	8,410
Class 8.....	5,740	5,983	6,126	6,319	6,512	6,705	6,898	7,091	7,284	7,477
Class 9.....	5,232	5,405	5,578	5,751	5,924	6,097	6,270	6,443	6,616	6,789
Class 10.....	4,680	4,837	4,994	5,151	5,308	5,465	5,622	5,779	5,936	6,093

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Federal salary comparison and adjustment policy

SEC. 111. (a) Section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 841; 5 U.S.C. 1172) is amended to read as follows:

"Implementation of policy

"Sec. 503. (a) In order to carry out the policy stated in section 502 of this Act, the President—

"(1) shall direct such agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate, annually to prepare and submit to him a report which compares the rates of salary, as fixed or authorized by or pursuant to law, for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

"(2) after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he deems appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, shall report annually to the Congress—

"(A) this comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates, and

"(B) such recommendations for revision of salary schedules, salary structures, and compensation policy, as he deems advisable.

"(b) Procedures established by the President under subsection (a) of this section for seeking the views of employee organizations shall provide authorized representatives of major Federal employee organizations the opportunity—

"(1) to review the findings of the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics annual survey and the results of the comparison of Federal salary schedules with rates of salary in private enterprise, and

"(2) to submit their comments and recommendations for consideration.

Comments and recommendations submitted in accordance with clause (2) of the immediately preceding sentence shall be transmitted to the President with the report submitted to him, by the agency or agencies he directs, which compares the rates of salary fixed or authorized by or pursuant to law for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise."

(b) (1) The rates of compensation and the ranges of rates of compensation provided by the amendments made by section 102(a), section 105 (a), (b), and (c), section 109, and section 110 (a) and (b) of this title, and the rates of compensation provided for by section 113, section 114 (a), (b), and (c), and section 115 of this title, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1966, by percentages which are equal to the sum of—

(A) one-half of the percentage by which salary rates paid for the same level of work in private enterprise for the months of February and March of 1965, determined in accordance with policies and procedures utilized in carrying out the provisions of section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this title) exceed the rates and ranges of rates provided by the sections of this title referred to above, and

(B) the percentage by which salary rates paid for the same level of work in private enterprise for the months of February and March of 1966, determined in accordance with policies and procedures utilized in carrying out the provisions of section 503 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this title).

The increased rates and ranges of rates of compensation (other than rates within the purview of sections 113, 114, and 115 of this title) which shall become effective as provided in this subsection shall—

(1) have the same effect as if they were specific statutory enactments,

(2) be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volumes as the public laws, and

(3) be printed in the Federal Register.

(2) The provisions of—

(A) section 102(b) of this title (relating to officers and employees subject to the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949),

(B) section 105(d) of this title (relating to employees subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, and the Fourth Class Office Schedule), and

(C) section 110(c) of this title (relating to certain officers and employees subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946)

shall govern, respectively, as of the effective date of this subsection, the application and operation of paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to those officers and em-

ployees, respectively, within the purview of such sections. For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the term "effective date of this section", "such date", and "such effective date", wherever used in such sections 102(b), 105(d), and 110(c), mean the effective date of this subsection.

(c) The President with respect to the executive branch and the appropriate authority concerned with respect to the legislative and judicial branches, shall prescribe and issue, or provide for the preparation and promulgation of, such salary schedules, rates of salary, and ranges of salary rates as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions, accomplish the purposes, and govern the administration, of subsection (b) of this section. Each salary rate shall be fixed at a whole dollar amount.

Severance pay

SEC. 112. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this section applies to each civilian officer or employee in or under—

(1) the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States;

(2) the Library of Congress;

(3) the Government Printing Office;

(4) the General Accounting Office; or

(5) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(b) This section does not apply to—

(1) an officer or employee whose rate of basic compensation is fixed at a rate provided for one of the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule or is in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) an officer or employee serving under an appointment with a definite time limitation;

(3) an alien employee who occupies a position outside the several States and the District of Columbia;

(4) an officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, or any other retirement law or retirement system applicable to Federal officers or employees or members of the uniformed services, and who, at the time of separation from the service, has fulfilled the requirements for immediate annuity under any such law or system;

(5) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is receiving compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, except one receiving this compensation concurrently with salary or on account of the death of another person;

(6) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is entitled to receive other severance pay from the Government; or

(7) such other officers or employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate.

(c) An officer or employee to whom this section applies who is involuntarily separated from the service, on or after the effective date of this section, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, be paid severance pay in regular pay periods by the department, independent establishment, corporation, or other governmental unit, from which separated.

(d) Severance pay shall consist of two elements, a basic severance allowance and an age adjustment allowance. The basic severance allowance shall be computed on the basis of one week's basic compensation at the rate received immediately before separation for each year of civilian service up to and including ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority and two weeks' basic compensation at such rate for each year of civilian service beyond ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this on any other authority. The age adjustment allowance shall be computed on the basis of 10 per centum of the total basic severance allowance for each year by which the age of the recipient exceeds forty years at the time of separation. Total severance pay received under this section shall not exceed one year's pay at the rate received immediately before separation.

(e) An officer or employee may be paid severance pay only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of at least twelve months.

(f) If an officer or employee is reemployed by the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments shall be discontinued beginning with the date of reemployment and the service represented by the unexpired portion of the period shall be credited to the officer or employee for use in any subsequent computations of severance pay. For the purposes of subsection (e), reemployment which causes severance pay to be discontinued shall be considered as employment continuous with that serving as the basis for the severance pay.

(g) If the officer or employee dies before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments of severance pay with respect to such officer or employee shall be continued as if such officer or employee were living and shall be paid on a pay period basis to the survivor or survivors of such officer or employee in accordance with the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

(h) Severance pay under this section shall not be a basis for payment, nor be included in the basis for computation, of any other type of Federal or District of Columbia Government benefits, and any period covered by severance pay shall not be regarded as a period of Federal or District of Columbia Government service or employment.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committee employees

Sec. 113. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation.

Legislative branch

Sec. 114. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by H. Res. 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079; Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 291-303) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section; except, that this section shall not apply to the compensation of those employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule of such Act.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$30,000 per annum each. The compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$43,000 per annum. The compensation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$35,000 per annum each."

Federal judicial salaries

Sec. 115. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 672 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation

for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Increased uniform allowance

Sec. 116. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1114; 5 U.S.C. 2131), is amended by striking out "\$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150".

Conversion of pay periods of certain employees to biweekly basis

Sec. 117. (a) Section 6 of the Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 763), as amended (5 U.S.C. 84), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by adding the following: "And provided, That the compensation of any civilian officer or employee who is subject to this Act may be computed in accordance with the provisions of section 604(d) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944 (c))."

(b) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 241), relating to the compensation of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, which reads "payable monthly."

(2) That part of section 2 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 42), relating to the compensation of the Secretary to the Federal Trade Commission, which reads "who shall receive a salary, payable in the same manner as the salaries of the judge of the courts of the United States."

(3) That part of section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the compensation of judges of the Tax Court of the United States, which reads "to be paid in monthly installments."

Maximum salary increase limitation

Sec. 118. Except as otherwise provided in section 114(e) of this title, no rate of salary shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

Inclusion of members of Board of Parole in Level V of Federal executive salary schedule

Sec. 119. Section 303(e) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 421, 5 U.S.C. 2211(e)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(100) Members of the Board of Parole, Department of Justice."

Adjustment of salary rates fixed by administrative action

Sec. 120. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed by section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by $4\frac{1}{2}$ per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or

[illegible]

[illegible]

On page 7, strike out the schedule immediately following line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following schedule:

"PFS"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	\$4,060	\$4,195	\$4,330	\$4,465	\$4,600	\$4,735	\$4,870	\$5,005	\$5,140	\$5,275	\$5,410	\$5,545
2	4,395	4,540	4,685	4,830	4,975	5,120	5,265	5,410	5,555	5,700	5,845	5,990
3	4,750	4,910	5,070	5,230	5,390	5,550	5,710	5,870	6,030	6,190	6,350	6,510
4	5,105	5,320	5,490	5,660	5,830	6,000	6,170	6,340	6,510	6,680	6,850	7,020
5	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170	7,355	7,540
6	5,910	6,105	6,300	6,495	6,690	6,885	7,080	7,275	7,470	7,665	7,860	8,055
7	6,390	6,540	6,750	6,960	7,170	7,380	7,590	7,800	8,010	8,220	8,430	
8	6,840	7,070	7,300	7,530	7,760	7,990	8,220	8,450	8,680	8,910		
9	7,410	7,655	7,900	8,145	8,390	8,635	8,880	9,125	9,370	9,615		
10	8,075	8,345	8,615	8,885	9,155	9,425	9,695	9,965	10,235	10,505		
11	8,920	9,220	9,520	9,820	10,120	10,420	10,720	11,020	11,320	11,620		
12	9,870	10,200	10,530	10,860	11,190	11,520	11,850	12,180	12,510	12,840		
13	10,925	11,290	11,655	12,020	12,385	12,750	13,115	13,480	13,845	14,210		
14	12,060	12,460	12,860	13,260	13,660	14,060	14,460	14,860	15,260	15,660		
15	13,310	13,755	14,200	14,645	15,090	15,535	15,980	16,425	16,870	17,315		
16	14,725	15,215	15,705	16,195	16,685	17,175	17,665	18,155	18,645	19,135		
17	16,290	16,835	17,380	17,925	18,470	19,015	19,560	20,105	20,650	21,195		
18	18,060	18,660	19,260	19,860	20,460	21,060	21,660	22,260	22,860	23,460		
19	20,015	20,680	21,345	22,010	22,675	23,340	24,005	24,670				
20	22,185	22,925	23,665	24,405	25,145							

On page 7, strike out the schedule immediately following line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following schedule:

	"Per annum rates and steps"											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service: Fixed compensation per annum	\$2,300	\$2,410	\$2,520	\$2,630	\$2,740	\$2,850	\$2,960	\$3,070	\$3,180	\$3,290	\$3,400	\$3,510
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	103	105	107
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25

On page 8, strike out the schedule immediately following line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following schedule:

"Revenue units"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36	\$3,881	\$4,010	\$4,139	\$4,268	\$4,397	\$4,526	\$4,655	\$4,784	\$4,913	\$5,042	\$5,171	\$5,300
24 but less than 30	3,585	3,705	3,825	3,945	4,065	4,185	4,305	4,425	4,545	4,665	4,785	4,905
18 but less than 24	2,966	3,065	3,164	3,263	3,362	3,461	3,560	3,659	3,758	3,857	3,956	4,055
12 but less than 18	2,320	2,397	2,474	2,551	2,628	2,705	2,782	2,859	2,936	3,013	3,090	3,167
6 but less than 12	1,670	1,726	1,782	1,838	1,894	1,950	2,006	2,062	2,118	2,174	2,230	2,286
Less than 6	1,347	1,392	1,437	1,482	1,527	1,572	1,617	1,662	1,707	1,752	1,797	1,842

On page 19, strike out the schedule immediately following line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following schedule:

"Class 1	\$23,430	\$24,210	\$25,235									
Class 2	18,915	19,545	20,175		\$20,805	\$21,435	\$22,065		\$22,695			
Class 3	15,365	15,875	16,385		16,895	17,405	17,915		18,425			
Class 4	12,490	12,905	13,320		13,735	14,150	14,565		14,980			
Class 5	10,275	10,620	10,965		11,310	11,655	12,000		12,345			
Class 6	8,570	8,855	9,140		9,425	9,710	10,000		10,285			
Class 7	7,225	7,465	7,705		7,945	8,185	8,425		8,665			
Class 8	6,220	6,430	6,640		6,850	7,060	7,270		7,480			

On page 19, strike out the schedule immediately following line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following schedule:

"Class 1	\$15,365	\$15,875	\$16,385	\$16,895	\$17,405	\$17,915	\$18,425	\$18,935	\$19,445	\$19,955
Class 2	12,490	12,905	13,320	13,735	14,150	14,565	14,980	15,395	15,810	16,225
Class 3	10,275	10,620	10,965	11,310	11,655	12,000	12,345	12,690	13,035	13,380
Class 4	8,570	8,855	9,140	9,425	9,710	10,000	10,285	10,565	10,850	11,135
Class 5	7,225	7,465	7,705	7,945	8,185	8,425	8,665	8,905	9,145	9,385
Class 6	6,220	6,430	6,640	6,850	7,060	7,270	7,480	7,690	7,900	8,110
Class 7	5,655	5,845	6,035	6,225	6,415	6,605	6,795	6,985	7,175	7,365
Class 8	5,160	5,330	5,500	5,670	5,840	6,010	6,180	6,350	6,520	6,690
Class 9	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010

On page 16, strike out line 22 and all that follows through line 16 on page 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE"

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, \$25,235.
"Medical Director, \$22,185 minimum to \$25,145 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, \$17,020 minimum to \$22,105 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, \$17,020 minimum to \$22,105 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, \$17,020 minimum to \$22,105 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, \$17,020 minimum to \$22,105 maximum.

"(b) (1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"Physician and dentist schedule"

"Director grade, \$19,575 minimum to \$24,775 maximum.

"Executive grade, \$18,255 minimum to \$23,745 maximum.

Chief grade, \$17,020 minimum to \$22,105 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$14,640 minimum to \$19,050 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$12,490 minimum to \$16,225 maximum.

"Full grade, \$10,590 minimum to \$13,785 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$8,920 minimum to \$11,620 maximum.

"Nurse schedule"

"Assistant Director grade, \$14,640 minimum to \$19,050 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$12,490 minimum to \$16,225 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$10,590 minimum to \$13,785 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$8,920 minimum to \$11,620 maximum.

"Full grade, \$7,445 minimum to \$9,695 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,510 minimum to \$8,445 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$5,670 minimum to \$7,380 maximum."

On page 29, in line 3, strike out "4½ per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

On page 34, in line 1, strike out "4½ per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

Mr. DERWINSKI (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier in the debate on the bill to the fact that I would offer these amendments. Lest there be any misunderstanding I do not wish to be reported as the original author of these amendments. The real authorship lies in the administrators of the executive branch of the Government who proposed this rate increase to the committee.

Therefore, since there seems to be a rather bashful attitude on the majority side in supporting the recommendations of the administration, I find myself in a slightly embarrassing position, as a poor Republican rushing to the rescue of the administration.

What I have offered to the House in the form of the substitute amendments is the Administration proposal. It calls for a 3-percent level of pay increase as contrasted to the 4½ percent in the bill and the 4 percent as offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, in support of my substitute amendments may I say I believe this would be a very practical and economic step. They conform to the guidelines the President has so eloquently defended over the past year.

They would conform to the guidelines that the President so effectively imposed on the steel industry and the steel union. Therefore I feel it would be most consistent to have the House support the President's position and on behalf of the President without, of course, immediate direct support from the President, but on behalf of his administration I offer this substitute.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I regret very much to find the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in the position of being a rubber stamp for the Johnson administration. I ask that his amendment be rejected and that the amendment I have offered be approved.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the happy position of being against both motions at the same time. The gentleman from Illinois here proposes to cut back this bill to 3 percent.

The gentleman from Arizona proposes to cut it back to 4 percent. The bill which was reported out of the committee calls for 4½ percent. The majority of the committee, I think he quoted it at 20 to 3, came out with this bill and said right in the report:

The purpose of this legislation is to honor—through moderate but timely and meaningful salary adjustments—the pledges made by the committee, by the Congress, and by two Presidents of the United States that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those paid by private enterprise for the same levels of work.

This principle of comparability was strongly reaffirmed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message on pay increases.

Now, then, if that was a right and proper decision last month, why is it not a right and proper decision today?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I certainly will.

Mr. UDALL. I will tell him why it is not a right and proper decision today.

Mr. CORBETT. First I would like to know the condition of the gentleman's arm.

Mr. UDALL. My arm is in good shape. I can tell the gentleman it has not been twisted recently. The reason it is logical now is I want, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants, a salary bill this year and not a lot of conversation and dispute. The hard, cold fact is that at this late stage of the session, if we are going to do something for the Federal employees in justice and at least to keep the comparability principle from fading away on the horizon any farther, we have to retreat to a bill which the other body will take and that we have a chance of getting signed this year. I made my decision to offer this amendment on that basis.

Mr. CORBETT. Just a minute. The gentleman knows that the other body will do exactly what it pleases. Then we will be in a conference committee and we will then have some discussion back and forth. Something is going to happen by way of a compromise somewhere.

I hate to see this splendid majority of our committee and this body back down from what it believes to be right just because they think somewhere else there are going to be some mistakes made. Now, on this particular matter, I would say the majority of the members of the committee voted for 4½-percent increases all along the line, and they went further and said here in order to bring this thing more up to date let us go along and provide for a second installment of the increase for next year. So we went along and did that. I think if we do adopt either of these motions, we will have been backing down from a position that is proper and that we will have been submitting to something, and I do not know what it is but I recognize that when we had the military pay raise before us here we went right ahead and voted along with the committee. The bill was signed with plenty to spare. I am among those who think that this House ought to work its will and ought to follow the recommendations of the committee made last August. I think above all else that the

committee ought to follow its own judgment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy in this instance to follow the leadership of the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee in opposing both amendments. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee desires a 4½-percent increase as much as anyone on the floor. After all it is his bill. Therefore I am supporting his original and most desirable position in supporting the ranking minority member, and opposing these decreases.

Referring now to the gentleman from Illinois, I want to congratulate him for his consistency in the position he has assumed here as floor leader for the administration. What I want to know is this. Has the administration been converted to the philosophy of the gentleman from Illinois? If it has, this is comparable to the experience of the Apostle Paul on the road to Damascus, in which he was suddenly and totally converted and changed.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman, of course, is being slightly facetious, and I want to admit to the House that I have been slightly facetious in the position which I assume in support of the President's proposal. I am not really that great an advocate of the Great Society. But on August 9, I would like to remind the Members, the President signed a bill setting up a 40-hour week for postmasters. I was there with numerous other Members; we received a pen and witnessed an impressive ceremony. Here is what the President said at that time:

We have made recommendations for pay raises, and I think there is even some talk that you might want to spend more money in that regard than we have recommended. And I shouldn't be surprised that you don't take some action along that line.

I do want to say to all of you that it is going to be pretty difficult for the President to be the first person to be the chief wrecker of a noninflationary wage and price policy. President Kennedy established some guidelines, and I have signed two military pay bills * * * in 20 months. We had a substantial bill last year. We had one this year. And I am going to recommend one next year.

But I do hope that I am not confronted with a request from the unions and from the employers of this country that say to me: Mr. President, you are an employer and you decided that you could give x percent increase; and we think we ought to be allowed to have the same privilege that you have; because if you do that, you are going to promote inflation, and our whole noninflationary price policy is going by the wayside.

Therefore I say that the easiest way to get a bill is to pass a 3-percent bill that will meet the President's standards. The other body I am sure will be most cooperative and then we can all adjourn in a few weeks having provided all Federal employees with a pay raise that they deserve.

Therefore, in all logic, let us get behind my amendment and the President.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona, for the tremendous job he and his colleagues on the committee have done in bringing H.R. 10281 before the House. I have long been interested in the principle that employees of the Federal Government should be compensated on a basis comparable to employees of private industry. While the present bill does not by any means finish the job of achieving comparability, it goes a long way in that direction.

As the gentleman from Arizona knows, I have been greatly interested in the matter of providing protection, as a matter of law, to those Federal employees who are prohibited by their religion from working on certain days. In March of this year I introduced H.R. 6873 which would accomplish that objective by assuring such employees time off from duty on such days, the time to be made up on other days under appropriate regulations.

According to the information I have, many employees who are in this position are in fact accommodated under informal arrangements worked out with their supervisors and with their fellow employees. In my opinion, however, such informal accommodations are an unreliable and unsatisfactory way of assuring these employees that they will not be required to violate their religious obligations. They should be given that protection as a matter of right and not as a matter of informal accommodation.

If H.R. 10281 is adopted, it may well be that provision should be made so that employees who cannot work on certain days for religious reasons would be fairly treated with regard to overtime, neither favored nor penalized because of their religious obligations.

As the gentleman from Arizona knows, I have discussed with him the possibility of amending H.R. 10281 to cover these matters. After discussions with him and with representatives of various employee organizations affected, I have concluded that it would be undesirable and premature to introduce such amendments at this time.

I do hope, however, that it will be possible for hearings to be scheduled early next year on H.R. 6873 and similar bills which have been introduced so that we may proceed to give full consideration to the need for seeing to it that Federal employees who are forbidden to work on certain days are not penalized or discriminated against.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Federal employees of this country who have religious obligations on days other than Sunday, owe a real debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM]. Because of some practical and technical and difficult drafting reasons we were unable to agree to the amendment which he proposed.

But I want to assure the gentleman from New York that our committee will look into this matter very seriously next year. The gentleman has played a big part in bringing it to our attention. I believe we can resolve these things and we ought to resolve them.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position that has been taken by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], in opposition to both amendments. I believe that the level which is provided for in the committee bill is a practical level. I believe that one of the greatest assets the taxpayers of the United States have is the experience of our Government employees.

Mr. Chairman, recruiting is much more expensive than retention. I believe that retention is more likely at the level provided in the committee bill. I believe it will represent an economy in the long run to keep it at that level.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that both amendments are rejected.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the integrity of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee demands that we in the House look at these amendments more carefully. When the committee has come up with its decision and made up its mind, and made it up 20 to 3, that is no small margin. It represents a decided opinion.

Likewise, while I admire the gentleman from Arizona, I dislike hearing a loud, clear call for retreat of one-half percent in the pay raise for postal workers and Government employees. To me the difference between 4.5 percent and 4 percent is not a real economy. It represents just a gesture of retreat toward the President's position. If the House is going to adopt the President's position, then the position of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] must be taken. I strongly oppose that position, because that represents a 33½-percent whack out of this bill, and destroys the pledge of Congress for comparability of U.S. postal workers and Federal employees with private industry employees.

Mr. Chairman, we in this House should really be interested in comparability of U.S. Government employees with private industry even under this particular bill, at 4.5 percent increase in salaries we are not even matching that comparability at this time which this Congress promised our U.S. employees in 1962.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] a question with reference to amount.

If we take his 4-percent raise figure, we are talking about a 4-percent figure for this year but would we be binding ourselves for next year too?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, not at all. There

is no relationship whatsoever to the 4-percent figure this year and the formula raise which is provided for next year. In fact, if my amendment is agreed to, you actually increase the amount of the raise next year because one of the factors in next year's raise is half of the lag. If you do not take up the lag this year, you have to make up one-half of it next year.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. One further question.

How about the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois? What does that do next year?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield further, it has no effect on the raise for next year at all. It would still occur under the formula as provided in the bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Why does the gentleman take the position that a one-half of 1 percent cut is now indicated? What happened to make the gentleman feel that it should be this particular amount? Certainly it was not just a figure taken out of the air. Or was it to help a little to soften an approach toward the position of the President? Or is it just because you think you can get that figure through the Congress and past the President?

Mr. UDALL. I have lived with this bill for 6 months, and it is my judgment in view of the realities of adjournment at hand, the realities of the other body and the administration's position and what it might do to delay or defeat or bring about a veto of the bill, that we are either going to reduce it to 4 percent and get a bill this year, or we are going to stand pat and get no bill. That is my judgment in the matter.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There was voted out of the committee just 2 months ago an increase of 4.5 percent. This is a pretty quick switch. I have been in Congress the past several years, and I must say that the House has stood firm when it decided on a Federal pay raise. In our pay raise fight I voted twice to override President Eisenhower's veto because I felt the cause was right. I do not believe President Johnson will veto this bill for a matter of one-half of 1 percent.

For economy, Congress might cut Government services, but should not start on the U.S. Government career services. These are our fine and loyal U.S. employees, and let us treat them as such as Congress has the responsibility for them and their families. In 1962 Congress said to the U.S. Government employees "we will give you comparability." That to me is a real promise and Congress should make its word good.

I strongly favor passage of the full 4½-percent pay raise for Federal employees, and postal workers, as contained in the bill reported out by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 8, noes 103.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CORBETT) there were—ayes 107, noes 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 26, strike out "or" at the end of line 5; immediately following line 5 insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and".

And renumber paragraph (7) as paragraph (8).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment. I have three more similar technical amendments. This one deals with the severance pay feature of the bill. For many years the Tennessee Valley Authority has had a severance pay system which it negotiated with its employee organization.

Through an inadvertence, this language would apply the new severance pay system to the TVA. The officers and directors of the TVA and their counsel are anxious that they continue to have their present system which is very satisfactory.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] urged me to offer this amendment in his behalf. It is a good amendment and I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to point out to the House that all these amendments are completely acceptable. They are all technical amendments and perfecting amendments and they deserve the support of the Members.

May I also point out at this time, if the gentleman will permit me, in view of the rather one-sided defeat that I suffered a few moments ago and in order to expedite matters and save the time of the House, I will surrender my gavel on behalf of the President and will not this afternoon offer any more administration amendments.

Mr. UDALL. I appreciate the statement of the Johnson administration majority floor leader.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 34, immediately following line 13, insert the following:

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any

law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment also suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They now have a wage board or a similar system by which many pay schedules are fixed administratively. There was some fear that the language of the bill as now written would disturb that very satisfactory system.

The language of this amendment is only technical in nature and perfecting and I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 10, the sentence beginning in line 16 is amended to read as follows: "To provide service on days other than those included in the basic workweek, the Postmaster General (1) shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week and (2) may assign substitute employees to duty on days in addition to the days included in the basic workweek."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, after the bill was drafted, both the employee organizations and the Post Office Department were concerned that the language might prevent the assignment of substitutes to work on Sundays. It is not intended either by the Department, by the authors of the bill, or the employee organizations.

This amendment was worked out to clarify this to make sure that the original intent of the bill is carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 12, strike out beginning with line 8 on down through line 9 on page 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862; 5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall receive extra compensation, in addition to any other compensation provided for by law, as follows:

"(1) Each annual rate regular employee in or below salary level PFS-10 shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

"(2) Each annual rate regular employee in or above salary level PFS-11 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in

lieu thereof shall be paid extra compensation for the time so worked at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080.

"(3) For work performed on Christmas Day (A) each annual rate regular employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step, computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by 2,080, and (B) each substitute employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 50 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is a rather lengthy technical amendment and deals with a very minor subject. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman explain what this amendment is about?

Mr. UDALL. Yes; I intend to.

This amendment on page 12 of the committee bill rewrites the entire holiday pay subsection so as to eliminate a possible inequity that might have occurred under the language of the bill as reported. We found, for example, that the language of the reported bill would have permitted substitute clerks to work on holidays to be paid for such work at the rate of only \$2.40 an hour. Extra workers under the present law are paid \$2.48 an hour when called on to work on holidays. This has the approval of both the Department and the employee organizations and there is no objection to it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 25, line 13, strike out "the several States and the District of Columbia" and insert in lieu thereof "the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone".

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to correct an oversight in the bill and provide for severance pay for aliens employed in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government on the same basis on which the bill otherwise extends this benefit to aliens employed by the United States "in the several States and the District of Columbia." I might say that we are obligated by treaty with the Republic of Panama to assure to Panamanian citizens em-

ployed by the canal or the railroad equality of treatment with employees who are citizens of the United States of America. This was agreed to in the treaty of 1936. It was fortified further in the treaty of 1955, which required that equal basic wages be paid to employees in the Canal Zone irrespective of whether the individual concerned is a citizen of the United States or of the Republic of Panama.

The Members of this House all know, from my remarks here last Thursday, and the private discussions I have had with so many of the individual Members, how strongly I feel about the proposals this Government of ours has agreed to in principle dealing with what amounts to a giveaway of the present Panama Canal. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am vigorously opposed to turning over the canal, or an equal share in its management, to the small group of ruling families of Panama who would seek to exploit it entirely for their own financial gain. This has been the history of every transfer of assets of the Panama Canal Company to the Republic of Panama, particularly in the 1955 treaty. I have maintained that the average citizen of Panama would derive little or no benefit from a further giveaway of Canal Company assets to Panama—furthermore that many of the present Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone would lose their jobs because they would be replaced at much lower wage rates.

All of that, however, has nothing to do with our obligation to observe treaty commitments we have already made, and particularly to assure fair treatment on an equal basis for those Panamanian citizens who, over many years and onto the third generation, have given loyal and conscientious and faithful service to the U.S. Government in the Canal Zone.

Providing them with severance pay on the same basis as we are providing in this bill for severance pay for U.S. Government workers—citizen or alien—in the United States itself would be a further demonstration of the fact that the United States wants to help the people of Panama, not exploit them, as their own leaders so often do.

Therefore, I call upon the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to demonstrate once again, as we have done so often in the past, that we appreciate faithful service rendered to the United States by the aliens we employ in the Canal Zone, and that we continue to adhere to the commitments we have made for their welfare.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. In order to keep our treaty commitments and to treat Panamanian citizens properly and in the fashion we agreed to treat them, the amendment is necessary, and I am happy to agree to it and to accept it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I find no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. I am happy to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I have previously notified Members of the House that I had planned to offer an amendment to this section of the bill which would in effect repeal the confusing, archaic, 12-step—or what is now an 11-step—formula for computing the salaries of the staffs of individual Members of Congress.

This bill today will provide another step, a 12th step, in this complicated formula.

Many Members have told me that they would like to see the formula repealed and have one flat gross amount stated so that we would all know where we stood. Some Members have told me that the only objection to such an amendment, the only reason why it has not been repealed long ago, was that the present formula serves to prevent the public from knowing exactly what we are paying our employees.

I do not believe that is the case. If it were the case with any individual Member, we should be ashamed of it. That should not be an excuse for not repealing this. The public should know. In fact, I believe they do know.

More important, we should know ourselves what salary allowances we have and should provide a more convenient way in which to distribute our salary allowances.

I have been advised that a member of the Committee on House Administration would raise a point of order in the event that I offered the proposed amendment. I have been advised that possibly it would be ruled not germane by the present occupant of the chair. In view of that, I will withhold the amendment.

I have been advised also by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration which handles these matters, that he will give us a hearing on this matter if I introduce the proposal in the form of a separate bill.

Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman has stated it correctly. We will hold hearings in the latter part of January or the 1st of February next year. There will be a thorough hearing. We will go into it thoroughly. Perhaps we will adopt the bill. I do not know what the Members will desire to do. We will consider the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II Short Title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Salary Review Commission Act".

Federal Salary Review Commission

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby established a bipartisan commission, to be known as the "Federal Salary Review Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of eleven members, of whom (1) five shall be appointed by the President of the United States, not more than three of whom shall be of the same political party and one of whom so designated by him shall be Chairman; (2) two shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall not be of the same political party; (3) two shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall not be of the same political party; and (4) two shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States, who shall not be of the same political party.

(b) No person holding any office, appointive or elective, under the United States (except retired officers or employees) shall be eligible for appointment to the Commission. The first members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than January 31, 1966, and shall serve for one year. New members shall be appointed not later than January 31 every fourth year thereafter, beginning in 1970, for the same term. Members shall not be eligible for reappointment. Members shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be reimbursed for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(c) Appointment of employees may be without regard to the civil service laws, but their compensation shall be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Executive departments and agencies whose employees are compensated under the statutory salary systems may detail employees for service with the Commission without reimbursement. The services of experts and consultants may be obtained by the Commission under the authority of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem. Necessary funds are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Commission.

Commission salary reviews and reports

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall review the compensation, including rates of basic compensation and other forms of compensation, of (1) Senators, Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; (2) Justices and Judges of the United States; and (3) the salary levels established under the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, with a view to maintaining proper levels and relationships among the rates of basic compensation of these officers and salary levels, and with the salary rates of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission shall also review the principles, concepts, structures, and interrelationships of the statutory salary systems governing the compensation of Federal civilian employees of the executive departments and agencies.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President not later than January 1, 1967, and January 1 of every fourth year thereafter beginning in 1971, a report containing its recommendations concerning rates of basic compensation and other forms of compensation for the categories referred to in subsection (a) of this section, concerning the principles, structure, and rates of the statutory salary systems referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and concerning

such other matters relating to compensation as it deems pertinent.

Submission of compensation recommendations to Congress

SEC. 204. The President, after consideration of such report, shall transmit to the Congress, not later than March 31, 1967, and not later than March 31 of every fourth year thereafter, beginning in 1971, his recommendations as to the rates of basic compensation for the categories referred to in section 203 (a) and (b) of this title.

Permanent system for the establishment and maintenance of proper salary relationships in Federal executive, judicial, congressional, and career salaries

SEC. 205. Whenever the salary rates of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are increased by or pursuant to law, the salary rate of each office or position within the purview of sections 203 and 204 of title II, sections 303 and 304 of title III, and section 403 of title IV, of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 400), shall be increased automatically, effective at the beginning of the next Congress which begins immediately following the Congress during which the salary rates of such schedule are so increased, by a percentage equal to the greater of—

(1) the percentage of the increase so made in the maximum salary rate of such schedule, or

(2) the average percentage of the increases so made in the respective maximum salary rates of all grades of such schedule.

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of title II be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and considered as open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina: On page 38, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 5 on page 39.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORBETT. I wish to propose a substitute for the amendment. Shall I offer that now, or after the gentleman is recognized to speak on his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman's substitute amendment will be in order and may be offered after the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], has used his time.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed this amendment quite a bit during general debate. The amendment would strike section 205, which would give an automatic pay increase to Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, members of the executive branch, and also to judges.

It is my feeling, which I stated in general debate, that the committee and the Congress are abdicating their responsibility

in this area. The committee and also the Congress should go into the recommendations which will be made by the Federal Salary Review Commission, which is to be set up as provided in section 202. We should go into these recommendations very carefully and come out with some specific recommendations as to what the salaries should be. We should not try to hide behind any salary increases that Federal workers might get under the comparability principle. We should take out this section and meet our responsibilities four-square.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in earnest support of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] to strike out the congressional pay raises.

While I am one of the few Members of this House with absolutely no other income than my salary, I am happy with the more than generous increase last year. I think the Congress can easily wait until the need is urgent before raising congressional salaries again, and the Members can act forthrightly and meet the issue head on when the need does arise.

Our predecessors raised our salaries \$625 per month last year, and within 9 months of its effectiveness it is proposed that we provide two more—not one, but two—additional raises, the first of \$100 per month.

To me this is indefensible upon any grounds—fiscal, moral, or political, even though the effectiveness is postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CORBETT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CORBETT as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL]: Pages 38 and 39, strike out all of section 205 including the center heading and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PERMANENT SYSTEM FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPER SALARY RELATIONSHIPS IN FEDERAL EXECUTIVE, JUDICIAL, CONGRESSIONAL, AND CAREER SALARIES"

"SEC. 205. Whenever the salary rates of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are increased, effective after January 1, 1967, by or pursuant to law, the salary rate of each office or position within the purview of sections 203 and 204 of title II, sections 303 and 304 of title III, and section 403 of title IV, of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 400), shall be increased automatically, effective at the beginning of the next Congress which begins immediately following the Congress during which the salary rates of such schedule are so increased, by a percentage equal to the greater of—

"(1) the percentage of the increase so made in the maximum salary rate of such schedule, or

"(2) the average percentage of the increases so made in the respective maximum salary rates of all grades of such schedule."

Mr. CORBETT (interrupting the reading of the substitute amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD in full at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the point of this amendment is to prevent the necessity in the predictable future of the Congress having to face the job of raising its own salary by meeting here and voting. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], when he put this provision in a year ago performed a good service because he made it possible when the salary schedule is moving up to the point where the congressional salary ceiling is acting to compress the whole salary schedule of the Federal Government, then the congressional salary would automatically go up in line with the amount that level 18 goes up or the average for the whole classified service goes up if the compression has already hit level 18.

This formula should be preserved. The only way to preserve it is to adopt the amendment I have introduced. The choice is either to have an automatic increase or else to come in here someday in a couple of years and vote a congressional pay raise with all of the attendant publicity and criticism which occurs. I think this other fact ought to be emphasized also: If the Congress wants to come in and vote itself a pay raise, regardless of this provision, it can go ahead and do it anyhow. You can come in here and vote yourself a \$5,000 increase in salary if you want to, but this provision simply provides that for Cabinet officers, judges, top executives, and Members of Congress, you can get an automatic increase following 1969 which will be right in harmony with the classified pay raises and keep things in proper balance. I submit to you that this formula would make a real contribution to the continuation of orderly procedure regarding salaries. I sincerely hope that it will pass with your enthusiastic support.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What the gentleman is saying is that the two raises provided in this bill will not affect congressional salaries but any raises other than these two will provide an automatic increase in congressional salaries?

Mr. CORBETT. I greatly appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. In other words, in this bill where you have a raise occurring in October 1965 and in October 1966, it will not become effective in January 1967, but only pay raises that we might pass after January 1967 will have this effect. We will know full well when we pass them that they will become effective in 1969.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. In effect what the gentleman's substitute does is simply to change the effective date of the committee bill from January 1967 to January 1969 but will not allow cumulative increases passed by the Salary Act of 1965 which take effect in 1965 and 1966.

Mr. CORBETT. It would not allow them to take effect in 1967 and, in other words, we would not be having any congressional pay raise in this bill.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. POOL. In other words, what the gentleman is telling this House is that they are going to raise the salaries of all Federal employees and Members of Congress are going to wait until 1969 to get a raise, is that right?

Mr. CORBETT. And Cabinet officers.

Mr. POOL. I am against the gentleman's proposal and I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. CORBETT. I will say to the gentleman that the Constitution of the United States gives him every right to be as wrong as he wants to be.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for the last 2 years I have been engaged in urging pay raises for Members of Congress. The one thing that I have wanted to do—and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very constructive part in this matter—the one thing I have wanted to do is to make sure that we tackle this matter once and for all and get rid of it, and that never again, as long as we have a Congress, will Members be put in this unfortunate position of having to come in here and being the only Federal employees that have to take a position of voting on their own pay.

We devised a formula which simply keeps the system in balance. It keeps the system in balance all the way from the top to the bottom and from now forevermore will make sure that congressional salaries, Cabinet officers' salaries and Federal judges' salaries are related to the Federal salary system. Every time this comes up we get an acute case of congressional shakes and trepidations; and Members say, If we vote a salary raise in 1967 or 1969 or 1981 or 1985, if there is any bill that even hints or smells or suggests that there might be a salary raise involved for Congress that every Member of Congress is going to go down the drain.

Members who were here in the last Congress know that we faced up to this question. I hear speeches around here all the time to the effect, "Let us face our responsibilities, let us not be afraid." This is a tough responsibility that we have. You have got a chance now to set up some machinery that will forever resolve the question. All you have to do is to march down the teller line or stand up and be counted one time tonight, and that will be the end of it. It will be done for all time.

I have never talked to a Member yet who has quarreled with the basis of what I am trying to do here in this proposal, in this bill, and that is set up some adequate machinery. I have more confi-

dence in the American people than to think that they are a bunch of simple, foolish people, unsophisticated people, who do not recognize that this is the biggest enterprise on earth. We are the board of directors for a \$100 billion business. We control giant departments. We write the laws on which depend the safety and the welfare of the people of this country. I think the people recognize that we ought to be heard, and that we ought to be paid at least as much as the third vice president of some New York bank or the second vice president of some corporation.

Mr. Chairman, let me leave you with one thought. Many Members have said that a 1967 pay raise, not this year, but next year or the year after, would be difficult. Whatever you do, I hope and pray that you vote down the amendment and the Corbett substitute. If you cannot go all the way with it, and we get down to the question whether you are going to have this machinery or not, then you ought to support the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his substitute, because this is the thing that would establish the permanent machinery. Let us get this resolved tonight, because in the last 100 years before 1964, Congress raised its pay four times, an average of once every 25 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken a beating on this for 2 years. If we cannot write this permanent machinery into law tonight, I quit; I am not going to fight the battle any more. And I am telling you that it will be 15 or 20 years before any adjustments are made for Federal judges, Federal executives, or Members of Congress. This is the important decision that we face.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Does the gentleman know any Member who argued against a pay raise 2 years ago who refused to accept the increased salary?

Mr. UDALL. I am advised by the Sergeant at Arms that there was no such instance.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The salary of Congressmen should not be tied automatically to the salary level of other Federal employees. Any pro-

posal put forth in the future to increase the pay of postal and other civil service employees ought to be judged on its own merit. But a Congressman would have difficulty judging such a proposal solely on its merit if his own salary is going to be affected by his vote.

Whether Federal civil service employees would gain or lose by having their pay tied to congressional salaries is a matter on which opinions may differ. But there can be no doubt that the salaries of Federal employees will be affected by such an arrangement.

Because Congressmen are usually reluctant to vote themselves a pay raise—and they do so only at infrequent intervals—I am inclined to believe that Federal employees would be prejudiced and would actually suffer in the future under such an arrangement.

In any event, I am confident the public interest would suffer. I feel so strongly on this point that I intend to vote against the pending bill unless the automatic congressional pay feature is removed. If the Broyhill amendment is adopted, then I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] and in opposition to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that either section 205 in the bill or the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is basically a dodge as far as congressional responsibilities are concerned. In either case it is evident that the objective of it is to enable Members of Congress to avoid telling their constituents whether or not they individually voted themselves or had any part in pay raises affecting Members of Congress.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, this is a dodge of our congressional responsibilities.

This is likewise true in the case of pay for the judges and for the pay of Cabinet officers.

Last year in our best judgment we decided to make a different percentage increase in the pay of the Judges of the Supreme Court than we did in the case of the pay of the Cabinet members or the Members of Congress. We decided that the pay increase for the judges should be different percentage-wise than the pay increase for Cabinet officers, or the pay increase for Members of Congress.

I do not know whether 4 years from now it will be good judgment for us to give the same percentage increase to the members of the judicial branch as to the Cabinet officials or to the Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should reserve our right to make that decision at that time and not dodge this responsibility and go out to our constituents and say, "Yes, we did get a pay raise, but we had nothing to do with it; it was done by some previous Congress and we wash our hands of it and we have no responsibility for it."

Mr. Chairman, this is not my concept of the responsibility given to us under

the Constitution as the legislative branch of the Government and for this reason I support the Broyhill amendment.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Broyhill amendment to this bill—because Members of Congress should set the example in trying to hold the line on the runaway inflationary trend that seems to prevail.

The Broyhill amendment would strike from this bill the salary increase proposed for Members of Congress and I support the amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Broyhill amendment. I had a similar amendment to offer but because the gentleman from North Carolina was a member of the committee he was recognized first.

Mr. Chairman, to adopt either the provisions of the bill relative to congressional pay raises on the Corbett substitute is to avoid our responsibilities to our constituents. In view of our huge deficit, the enormous expenditures for questionable domestic programs, the additional outlay of funds necessitated by the Vietnamese war and the sacrifices we are called upon to make in the cause of national defense, it is absolutely imperative that we curtail nonessential expenditures. Certainly after receiving a huge salary increase last year, Congress should not now turn around, under these circumstances and immediately increase its salary again. How can this Government justify asking industry to curtail price increases, or labor to limit wage increases to 3 or 4 percent, then turn around and raise the salary of Congress by more than 11 percent after such a large raise last year. This Congress has demonstrated very little fiscal responsibility, but to add another pay raise now is taxing the understanding of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to adopt the Broyhill amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Broyhill amendment and in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. Chairman, no matter how thin or thick it is cut, the Corbett amendment means an automatic pay increase after a period of time for Members of Congress. In other words, Members of Congress voting for an increase for Federal employees at a future time, will automatically benefit from the increase that they have voted for the employees.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] in asserting that we have no knowledge of what the situation will be in this country 2 years hence or even a year hence with respect to Government finances.

Mr. Chairman, this is ducking and dodging. With the provision in the bill or with the Corbett amendment we are ducking and dodging on this issue. We are riding on the coattails of salary increases which the Congress itself will vote to Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to defeat the Corbett amendment and adopt the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], which will strike out automatic pay increases for Members of Congress.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I simply want to say that there will be some on this side of the aisle who share your views. I agree with the gentleman that the Broyhill amendment should pass and that the Corbett amendment should not.

I believe it is our responsibility, and I think the people expect us to come here and say when we are going to raise our salaries. I do not think we ought to duck it. I think when that time comes we ought to rise up to it and for that reason I am in agreement with the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] with whom I do not always agree, but I do on this issue.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Iowa says we are ducking and dodging on this issue and let us not duck or dodge our responsibilities.

Last year we had a pay bill which after 15 years would have raised what was largely an outrageously low congressional salary. The gentleman from Iowa faced his responsibility by voting against it.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. UDALL. Yet, when we propose to do this in an orderly fashion and in a permanent fashion that will—

Mr. GROSS. No; I will not agree with the gentleman that this is meeting squarely the issue of a pay increase for Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the Federal judiciary.

We would not be facing up to our responsibility in orderly fashion. We would be riding the coattails of future increases which we voted to employees of the Federal Government. This is what we will be doing unless we adopt the Broyhill amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Corbett amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us be as practical as we can. It is not easy for Members to vote themselves a pay increase. As a matter of fact, it is something we naturally duck. But, let us look at the facts of life. Sooner or later there will be another congressional salary increase. Maybe it is not going to be in 1969 or 1970, it may be in 1971 or 1975. If we wait without setting up a proper procedure we will be forced to consider tremendous increases in our salaries, because a raise from \$30,000 to \$40,000 in 1975 would follow a pattern. The raise from \$22,500 to \$30,000 was too much at one time.

If we establish the machinery for a small percentage increase in salaries based on the cost of living and other

factors, I believe it will be the most effective way of meeting this subject.

The gentleman from Arizona has spent most of the afternoon receiving commendations of Members for handling the bill. This is the section of the bill wherein he devoted special attention. He recognized that it is not an easy thing politically to be advocating a pay increase for himself and 534 other Members. But he wants to do the practical thing. This is the practical, long-term approach, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered the additional practicability of not putting the burden of a pay increase on any Member of the present Congress.

If we want to be practical, if we want to approach this from the standpoint of orderly procedure, this is the answer. We will not have to jump our salaries years from now when the financial pressures on Members may require it. We also recognize there are individual Members who could afford to give away their salary, but there are Members having a hard time making ends meet. We cannot adjust salaries to suit the personal background of the individual. But we can do the most practical thing, and that is to accept the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that will establish, come 1969, in an orderly and controlled way, an increase in the congressional salaries.

May I point out to the gentleman from Iowa that come 1967 we will have another Federal pay bill on the floor, so that if at that time the economic position of the country has changed, if at that time the cost of keeping the peace will have risen to new heights, we could revoke the Corbett amendment.

In other words, we will have another shot at this. But the logical way to proceed and the really honest and effective way to proceed is to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. In my opinion, the logical way to proceed is to raise the Congressman's salary every time Federal employees get a raise. Then you would not have to come out here and try to get a raise of \$7,500 or \$10,000. It is almost impossible to get a raise. That is what happened the last time. Be practical about this. The American public is not going to get mad at Congressmen for doing the right thing. There is nothing wrong with Congressmen getting the same increases and raises that other Federal employees get, and if anybody can show me that I am wrong on that, I will resign from the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Now we are apparently about to climb on the backs of the Federal employees and get a ride; is that about the situation?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman from Iowa knows that I opposed last year's congressional pay bill because it

was too large an increase in 1 year. The way to meet the problem is by an orderly procedure. But so that I will not be misunderstood, let me emphasize to the Members that my support of the Udall-Corbett position is an individual position. At this point I am no longer speaking for the administration.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered and of which I am a cosponsor will delete that section of the bill which provides for Members of Congress when other employees receive such a raise. I offer this amendment in order that I might vote for this bill, which would grant a much-needed pay raise to the other men and women who work so diligently for our Government. If the provision for automatic pay increases remains in this bill, I am certain that many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will be forced to join with me in opposing this legislation.

The pay raise for Members of Congress could amount to almost 10 percent when the 90th Congress convenes in January of 1967. I oppose this raise and such future automatic raises for two reasons:

First of all, this—the 89th Congress—is the recipient of a whopping \$7,500 per year boost in pay increase. This raise is more than the entire income of most of the residents of my district.

Earlier this year, this body decided to raise the salaries of Army privates \$8 per month but now is considering giving itself another raise which could amount to \$3,000 per year. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the American people will stand for such an inequity.

Second, I recognize the fact that on occasion a pay raise for Members of Congress will be justified. On those occasions, I believe that the American people will also recognize the need and will not object to the Congress authorizing such an increase. But, I sincerely believe that the people whom we represent will object to authorizing such automatic pay raises, whether or not they are warranted. No Member should object to standing up and casting his vote to raise his salary as has always been done in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that it is vitally important that we remove this section from the bill. If the Members of this body believe that such a raise is justified, let us bring up such a bill and vote on it. If we do so, the American people will know where each one of us stands on the issue. If we vote on such a bill, it will pass or meet defeat on its merits. But to allow such a raise to come through the back door—through the provision of automatic pay raises—I believe that the Members of this body will be abdicating their responsibility.

I do not believe that any such pay raise is warranted at this time. We cannot very well discuss the problems of poverty on one day and on the next earmark

funds far into the future which will be used to pad salaries of that segment of the population which needs it least.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to my colleagues to support the amendment which will delete this section of the bill. With the deletion of this section, we will assure passage of legislation which provides a warranted raise for our civil employees.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Broyhill amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] made excellent statements and I commend them. If the congressional pay increase is to be automatic each time there is a classified and postal employees pay increase, we will have placed every future pay increase bill in the future in the same untenable position that last year increase was placed. I felt that a \$7,500 pay increase was not justified nor was the increase for executive and judicial positions. The situation will just be continued in the future with this automatic increase so I ask that the Broyhill amendment be adopted. Our present salary ought to stand for some time into the future and any further increase ought to come only after the report of a thorough executive, congressional task force study.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment on which we are about to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina and Mr. UDALL.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer two perfecting amendments,

and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 37, line 6, after "States" insert the following: "Referees in Bankruptcy, the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and Commissioners of the Court of Claims".

On page 38, line 17, delete the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 402(d) and".

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, these are two perfecting amendments which I believe came about as a result of an oversight.

The first amendment would include certain judicial officers within the purview of the Federal salary review authorized under section 203(a) of the bill.

The second amendment would include referees in bankruptcy in section 205 of the bill which provides for automatic adjustment in salary rates for Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress.

Both amendments would perfect the bill and would carry forward the uniform treatment of certain judicial officers in accordance with the policy contained in Public Law 88-426, the Federal Judiciary Salary Act of 1964.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I have studied the amendments offered by the gentlemen. They were proposed by the Administrative Office of the Courts. They are necessitated because we were not given the information in time by the court system. They have no cost associated with them. I believe they are good amendments, and I support them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

I wish to say to my colleagues that, so far as I know, we have disposed of most, if not all, of the amendments to be proposed. In view of the kind of things which have been said today, I thought I might balance the day up by losing some of my friends, in reading to the House some poetry. I had compiled a poem in honor of this occasion.

We have heard so much about guidelines and inflation and the difficulties we had in connection with this, so, with apologies to Robert W. Service, H. R. GROSS, BILLY MATTHEWS, and some of the other great poets of the House, in view of the fact that we have passed the arts and humanities bill, and in view of the need for culture in the Nation and in the House, perhaps a little poetry would end the day on a proper note.

This great document goes as follows:

AN ODE TO SOME GUIDELINES

Oh, the Capitol lights have seen strange sights,

But the strangest they ever did see
Was the fight on the Hill for the salary bill
To give full comparability.

Oh the threat of inflation, the debt of the
Nation,

Cause the mailman's pay to lag behind,
you see.

But it's not the same tough deal when you
get to U.S. Steel

Or the generals and the brass at DOD.

Four percent's okay for Abel sitting at the
salary table,

And it's good for you and me and General
Motors,

But for the postal clerk? Why, by some
strange quirk,

This would shock the mass of undecided
voters.

Should the pay be quite inferior down at
Justice and Interior,

While truckers and longshoremen climb
up high?

Would it really be unbearable to make the
pay comparable

For your mailmen and the boys at FBI?

Should we heed the rigid guidelines and
leave NASA on the sidelines,

And tell them maybe later will be fine?

Should the Federal men all moonlight, and
their friend give up the fight.

And maybe do the job in 69.

At the risk of my life I will read one
final stanza, since I have had such an
enthusiastic reception:

To you in the Grand Old Party, make your
speeches loud and hearty,

And should the final voting turn out close,
I think you really oughter recall our friend

Goldwater—

Vote with us and not the fearless H. R.
Gross.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VIGORITO

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I
offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VIGORITO: Page
38, line 16, strike out "sections 203 and 204"
and insert in lieu thereof "section 203".

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, a parlia-
mentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will
state it.

Mr. UDALL. I understood that this
section had just been voted on and the
matter disposed of in relation to the
amendments offered by the gentleman
from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] and
the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr.
BROYHILL].

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the
parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will
state that the section is still open for
amendments and clarifying amend-
ments.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, my
amendment is a very simple and brief
amendment. It differs from a preceding
amendment that was defeated earlier
which struck out the whole section from
line 9 on down to the following page.
My amendment merely will strike out
and eliminate the automatic pay raises
for Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on
the amendment offered by the gentleman
from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF
MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chair-
man, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Mis-
souri: On page 39, line 5, substitute a semi-
colon for the period and add the following
proviso: "Provided, That there shall be no in-
crease in any congressional salaries until and
unless there shall have been a reduction in
the national debt, and the Congress shall
have curtailed appropriations to the extent
that a balanced budget has been maintained
for the two fiscal years prior to the beginning
of the Congress in which such increase in
salaries would have taken place."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chair-
man, we have heard a lot about respon-
sibility. We have heard a lot about
comparability. All this amendment
seeks to do is, if we operate this Gov-
ernment in a businesslike manner, and
if we try to conserve the finances of the
Government, then I think we would be
entitled to a pay raise. During the past
12 years, in 10 of those years we were
having about the most prosperous times
we could have had, but the national debt
has continued to go up. We had a bal-
anced budget I think 2 years out of the
last 20. If we are the operators and are
responsible for the operation of this
Government, we are doing a pretty poor
job, because we continue to lose money
every year. We do not have the intel-
ligence or the nerve to tax people enough
to pay for all of the commitments we
are making all over the land. All this
means is that when Congress meets its
responsibility in balancing the budget,
then I think you would have an oppor-
tunity and would deserve an increase
in pay. Until that time comes I do not
think we have any reason to ask the peo-
ple to pay us an increased salary. If you
were operating a private business and
your board of directors could not op-
erate that business properly, I do not
think they would feel as though the
stockholders should increase the salary
of those who were responsible for the
operation of that business. I think this
amendment here would place the re-
sponsibility where it belongs. When you
do a good job you will be eligible for a
pay increase.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in
opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with
the purposes of the gentleman's amend-
ment but on three conditions I might
find it possible to vote for it. First, if
it is defeated, if the gentleman will re-
fuse to take the salary increase. I no-
tice he did not refuse to take the last one,
although he is against it.

Second, if the budget is not balanced,
if he will give up his trips to the Inter-
parliamentary Union which sometimes
take him around the world.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chair-
man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am not going to give up
any of my trips.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All right.

Mr. HAYS. Because I am for the bill.
And, third, if the gentleman will vote to
cut up the sugar lumps and cut giving
out all of this gravy in sugar, and what-
have-you, to the sugar producers, if we
will just tax that instead of giving it
around willy-nilly to the one who has
the highest paid lobbyist, maybe we can
balance the budget. If you will agree to

those three things, I will vote for your
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on
the amendment offered by the gentle-
man from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.
Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I
move to strike out the requisite number
of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the
amendment striking the congressional
pay increase section failed during the
teller vote which we just completed. It
has always been my thinking that we
should not tie our pay increases to any
gadget which would allow us to shirk our
responsibilities. I am vitally interested
in the bill which is before us and it is my
hope that we do not jeopardize it by tying
congressional pay to it.

President Johnson has worked hard on
the other side of the aisle lining up sup-
port for further reduction in the increase
which will be paid to our employees. I
think he is wrong. This is one of the few
areas which the word "economy" even
seems to concern this administration.
Far better to pay our breadwinners who
are serving their Government a fair in-
come to support their families than to
pour billions into wasteful foreign-aid
projects, feed our enemy and inaugurate
new and wasteful poverty programs in
this country. The President feels that a
3-percent increase is enough. I do not
and opposed the amendment to reduce
the 4½ percent provided in the bill to 4
percent.

I am hopeful that we can restore this
cut and take out the congressional es-
cape valve pay increase which has
sneaked into this bill. I firmly support
the concept of paying a man what he is
worth and the principle of compara-
bility. Let us make this a bill which we
can be proud of.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move
to strike out the requisite number of
words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this au-
dience. It is the largest that I have ad-
dressed since the campaign. I regret
that unlike the previous speaker I do not
have any poetry for you. I tried to recall
something from the "Face on the Bar-
room Floor" that would fit the well of
this House, but I was unable to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that if the
Congress looks carefully at this bill we
will find some things that should cause
us some concern as we go back to our
communities.

I took the liberty of calling a large
hospital that serves the people of my
district. I did so because after hearing
about the comparability feature I was
concerned about the starting pay of
some of the positions in the Veterans'
Administration hospitals.

I found in one of the best private hos-
pitals on the outskirts of Greater Boston
that the chief pharmacist gets \$125 a
week and the chief dietitian gets \$150 a
week. In the veterans hospitals of simi-
lar size they may expect to get from \$50
to \$75 more per week.

Then I looked into the nurse situation.
We start them off in this bill at around
\$6,000. In Greater Boston they go to
work for \$96 a week.

Then I looked at the fringe benefits. The average private or charitable hospital—and I suspect that the hospitals of your districts do not do any better than the hospitals in Boston—the hospitals in Boston start these nurses at \$96 a week; and in many cases there is no group insurance, no severance pay, only 2 weeks' vacation, no pension plan, and overtime pay is at the regular rate.

I just wanted to get this off my chest, to say that this comparability feature does not apply in many areas where we have been led to believe that it does apply. I think that when we ask our hospitals at home to continue to serve our patients at \$27 to \$38 a day, depending on whether it is ward care or a private room, we must recognize that if they have to compete with the Federal Government they may have to raise that charge to \$50 a day.

Mr. Chairman, I feel we should reflect upon this feature of this bill and recognize the problem that we are creating when we compel semiprivate and charitable hospitals to compete with the pay schedules and fringe benefits that we are establishing for these veterans' hospitals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to decent wages for Federal employees—I am interested in their morale and in their welfare. I have always supported pay increases that have been necessary to enable them to support themselves and their families in a manner comparable—and in some instances even better—than their counterparts in the private community. For example, you all know of my support for the pay raise for the personnel in the armed services.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must consider also the impact that this wage increase will have on both the patients and the employees in the private hospitals. In my opinion, the comparability feature as it pertains to professional personnel in the medical field has been unnecessarily stretched in the bill before us.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I intend to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to strike section 205 on pages 38 and 39 of the bill, the amendment which I offered a short time ago. This motion to recommit will strike this section which applies to future pay increases for Members of Congress, executives, members of the Cabinet, and judges.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 536, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 10281, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following amendment: On page 38, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 5 on page 39.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 140, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—238

Abbott	Cleveland	Gibbons
Abernethy	Collier	Gilligan
Anderson,	Conable	Greigg
Tenn.	Conte	Grider
Andrews,	Cooley	Griffin
Glenn	Corbett	Gross
Andrews,	Craley	Grover
N. Dak.	Cramer	Gurney
Arends	Cunningham	Hagan, Ga.
Ashbrook	Curtin	Haley
Ashmore	Curtis	Hall
Ayres	Dague	Halleck
Baldwin	Davis, Ga.	Halpern
Bandstra	Davis, Wis.	Hamilton
Baring	de la Garza	Hansen, Idaho
Bates	Devine	Harsha
Battin	Dickinson	Harvey, Ind.
Beckworth	Diggs	Harvey, Mich.
Belcher	Dole	Hechler
Bell	Donohue	Henderson
Bennett	Dowdy	Herlong
Berry	Downing	Horton
Betts	Dulski	Hull
Boggs	Duncan, Tenn.	Hungate
Boland	Dwyer	Hutchinson
Bow	Dyal	Ichord
Bray	Edmondson	Jarman
Brock	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Pa.
Broomfield	Ellsworth	Jonas
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Jones, Ala.
Buchanan	Everett	Jones, Mo.
Burleson	Farnsley	Kastenmeier
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Keith
Cahill	Findley	King, N.Y.
Callan	Fisher	King, Utah
Callaway	Flynt	Kornegay
Casey	Foley	Kunkel
Cederberg	Ford, Gerald R.	Laird
Chamberlain	Fountain	Landrum
Chelf	Fulton, Pa.	Langen
Clancy	Fulton, Tenn.	Latta
Clausen,	Fuqua	Lennon
Don H.	Gathings	Lipcomb
Clawson, Del.	Gettys	Love

McCarthy	Pickle	Smith, N.Y.
McClary	Pike	Smith, Va.
McCulloch	Pirnie	Springer
McDade	Poage	Stafford
McEwen	Poff	Staibbaum
McMillan	Pucinski	Stanton
McVicker	Quile	Steed
MacGregor	Quillen	Stratton
Machen	Race	Stubblefield
Mahon	Randall	Talcott
Marsh	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Martin, Mass.	Reifel	Teague, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.	Reinecke	Thomson, Wis.
Matthews	Reuss	Tuck
Meeds	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tuten
Mills	Rhodes, Pa.	Utt
Mink	Roberts	Van Deerlin
Minshall	Rogers, Colo.	Vanik
Moeller	Rogers, Fla.	Vigorito
Monagan	Rogers, Tex.	Vivian
Moore	Roudebush	Waggonner
Morrison	Roush	Walker, Miss.
Morse	Ryan	Watkins
Morton	Satterfield	Watson
Mosher	Saylor	Watts
Murray	Schisler	Whalley
Natcher	Schmidhauser	White, Idaho
Nelsen	Schneebeli	White, Tex.
O'Brien	Schweiker	Whitener
O'Hara, Mich.	Secrest	Whitten
O'Konski	Selden	Widnall
Olson, Minn.	Senner	Williams
O'Neal, Ga.	Shriver	Wright
Passman	Sikes	Wylder
Patten	Skubitz	Yates
Pelly	Slack	Younger
Perkins	Smith, Calif.	

NAYS—140

Adams	Grabowski	Multer
Addabbo	Gray	Murphy, Ill.
Albert	Green, Oreg.	Nedzi
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	Nix
Ashley	Griffiths	Olsen, Mont.
Barrett	Gubser	O'Neill, Mass.
Bingham	Hagen, Calif.	Ottinger
Blatnik	Hanley	Pepper
Bolling	Hanna	Philbin
Brademas	Hansen, Wash.	Pool
Brooks	Harris	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hathaway	Price
Broyhill, Va.	Hawkins	Reld, N.Y.
Burke	Hays	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks	Ronan
Cabell	Holland	Rooney, N.Y.
Cameron	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Huot	Rosenthal
Clark	Irwin	Rostenkowski
Clevenger	Jacobs	Roybal
Cohelan	Jennings	St Germain
Conyers	Joelson	St. Onge
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Culver	Karsten	Shipley
Daddario	Karth	Sickles
Daniels	Kee	Sisk
Delaney	Kelly	Staggers
Dent	King, Calif.	Stephens
Denton	Kirwan	Sullivan
Dingell	Kluczynski	Sweeney
Evans, Colo.	Krebs	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Leggett	Tenzer
Farbstein	Long, Md.	Todd
Farnum	McDowell	Trimble
Fascell	McFall	Tunney
Fino	McGrath	Tupper
Flood	Mackay	Udall
Fogarty	Mackie	Ullman
Ford,	Madden	Walker, N. Mex.
William D.	Mailliard	Weitner
Fraser	Mathias	Wilson,
Friedel	Matsunaga	Charles H.
Gallagher	Miller	Wolf
Garmatz	Minish	Young
Gialmo	Moorhead	Zablocki
Gilbert	Morgan	
Gonzalez	Moss	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Derwinski

NOT VOTING—53

Adair	Dow	Lindsay
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Oreg.	Long, La.
Andrews,	Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald
George W.	Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	May
Bolton	Goodell	Michel
Bonner	Hansen, Iowa	Mize
Burton, Utah	Hardy	Morris
Carter	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Celler	Hollifield	O'Hara, Ill.
Colmer	Hosmer	Patman
Dawson	Johnson, Okla.	Purcell
Dorn	Keogh	Redlin

Rivers, S.C. Scott Toll
Rivers, Alaska Smith, Iowa Willis
Robison Thomas Wilson, Bob
Roncalio Thompson, N.J. Wyatt
Rumsfeld Thompson, Tex.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
Mr. Rumsfeld for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
Mr. Wyatt for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.
Mr. Carter for, with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois against.
Mr. Mize for, with Mr. Roncalio against.
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Aspinall.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Messrs. ANDERSON of Tennessee, FULTON of Tennessee, HECHLER, O'BRIEN, DULSKI, PASSMAN, WAGGONER, and COOLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ERLBORN and Mr. O'KONSKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RUMSFELD. If he were here he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit I report back the bill, H.R. 10281, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 5 on page 39.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 7, answered "present" 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—370

Abbott Duncan, Tenn. Keith
Abernethy Dwyer Kelly
Adams Dyal King, Calif.
Addabbo Edmondson King, N.Y.
Anderson Edwards, Ala. King, Utah
Tenn. Ellsworth Kirwan
Andrews Erlenborn Kluczynski
Glenn Evans, Colo. Kornegay
Andrews, N. Dak. Everett Krebs
Annunzio Fallon Kunkel
Arends Farbstain Laird
Ashbrook Farnsley Landrum
Ashley Farnum Langen
Ashmore Fascell Latta
Ayres Feighan Leggett
Baldwin Pino Lennon
Bandstra Fisher Lipscomb
Baring Flood Long, Md.
Barrett Flynn Love
Bates Fogarty McCarthy
Battin Foley McClory
Beckworth Ford, William D. McCulloch
Belcher Fountain McDade
Bell Fraser McDowell
Bennett Friedel McEwen
Berry Fulton, Pa. McFall
Betts Fulton, Tenn. McGrath
Bingham Fuqua McMillan
Blatnik Gallagher McKicker
Boggs Garmatz MacGregor
Boland Gathings Machen
Bolling Gettys Mackay
Bow Gialmo Madden
Brademas Gibbons Mahon
Bray Gilbert Mailiard
Brock Gilligan Marsh
Brooks Gonzalez Martin, Mass.
Broomfield Grabowski Martin, Nebr.
Brown, Calif. Gray Mathias
Broyles, N.C. Green, Oreg. Matsunaga
Broyhill, Va. Green, Pa. Matthews
Buchanan Gregg Meeds
Burke Grider Miller
Burton, Calif. Griffin Mills
Byrne, Pa. Griffiths Minish
Byrnes, Wis. Gross Mink
Cabell Grover Minshall
Cahill Gubser Moeller
Callan Gurney Monagan
Callaway Hagan, Ga. Moore
Cameron Hagen, Calif. Moorhead
Carey Haley Morgan
Casey Hall Morrison
Cederberg Halleck Morse
Chamberlain Halpern Morton
Chelf Hamilton Mosher
Clancy Hanley Moss
Clark Hanna Multer
Clausen, Hansen, Idaho Murphy, Ill.
Don H. Hansen, Wash. Murphy, N.Y.
Clawson, Del. Harris Murray
Cleveland Harsha Natcher
Clevenger Harvey, Ind. Nedzi
Cohelan Harvey, Mich. Nelsen
Collier Hathaway Nix
Conable Hawkins O'Brien
Conte Hays O'Hara, Mich.
Conyers Hechler O'Konski
Cooley Heistoski Olsen, Mont.
Corbett Henderson Olson, Minn.
Corman Herlong O'Neal, Ga.
Craley Hicks O'Neill, Mass.
Cramer Holland Ottinger
Culver Horton Passman
Cunningham Howard Patten
Curtin Hull Pelly
Daddario Hungate Pepper
Dague Huot Perkins
Daniels Hutchinson Philbin
Davis, Ga. Ichord Pickle
Davis, Wis. Irwin Pike
de la Garza Jacobs Pirnie
Deaney Jarman Poff
Dent Jennings Pool
Denton Joelson Powell
Devine Johnson, Calif. Price
Dickinson Johnson, Pa. Pucinski
Diggs Jonas Quile
Dingell Jones, Ala. Quillen
Dole Jones, Mo. Race
Donohue Karsten Randall
Dowdy Karth Reid, Ill.
Downing Kastenmeyer Reid, N.Y.
Dulski Kee Reifel

Reinecke Shipley Ullman
Resnick Shriver Utt
Reuss Sickles Van Deerlin
Rhodes, Ariz. Sikes Vanik
Rhodes, Pa. Sisk Vigorito
Roberts Skubitz Vivian
Rodino Slack Waggonner
Rogers, Colo. Smith, Calif. Walker, Miss.
Rogers, Fla. Smith, N.Y. Walker, N. Mex.
Rogers, Tex. Springer Watkins
Ronan Stafford Watson
Rooney, N.Y. Staggers Watts
Rooney, Pa. Staibaum Weltner
Rosenthal Stanton Whalley
Rostenkowski Steed White, Idaho
Roudebush Stephens White, Tex.
Roush Stratton Whitener
Roybal Stubblefield Whitten
Ryan Sullivan Widnall
Satterfield Sweeney Williams
St. Germain Talcott Wilson
St. Onge Taylor Charles H.
Saylor Teague, Calif. Wolff
Scheuer Tenzer Wright
Schisler Thomson, Wis. Wylder
Schmidhauser Todd Yates
Schneebell Trimble Young
Schweiker Tunney Younger
Selden Tupper Zablocki
Senner Tuten Udall

NAYS—7

Burleson Poage Tuck
Curtis Smith, Va.
Findley Teague, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Derwinski

NOT VOTING—54

Adair Ford, Gerald R. O'Hara, Ill.
Albert Frelinghuysen Patman
Anderson, Ill. Goodell Purcell
Andrews, Hansen, Iowa Redlin
George W. Hardy Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall Hébert Rivers, Alaska
Bolton Hollifield Robison
Bonner Hosmer Roncalio
Burton, Utah Johnson, Okla. Rumsfeld
Carter Keogh Scott
Celler Lindsay Smith, Iowa
Colmer Long, La. Thomas
Dawson Macdonald Thompson, N.J.
Dorn Martin, Ala. Thompson, Tex.
Dow May Toll
Duncan, Oreg. Michel Willis
Edwards, Calif. Mize Wilson, Bob
Evins, Tenn. Morris Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rumsfeld for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. May.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Mize.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Aspinall.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Redlin with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 10281.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

PATMAN INTRODUCES BILL TO PERMIT NECESSARY UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FINANCING PROGRAMS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is urgent that the Small Business Administration revolving fund be "beefed up" to the level of loans permitted by law. In partial response to the needs of small business, which the SBA is designed to fill, I have introduced H.R. 11306. I earnestly hope that this extremely important measure may be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment. It is truly emergency legislation.

The bill would increase from \$1,721 to \$1,841 million the total amount of the revolving fund authorization established by section 4(c) of the Small Business Act for the purposes of the financial assistance programs conducted by the Small Business Administration pursuant to that act and pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

In substance section 4(c) presently permits SBA to have as much as \$1,841 million outstanding from the fund at any particular time for the purposes of the agency's financial assistance programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Nevertheless, it restricts appro-

priations for these same purposes to \$1,721 million.

Until recently, the section has always provided funding authority equal to the full sum of the separate dollar limitations on SBA's financial assistance activity. The present discrepancy of \$120 million stems from Public Law 89-78, which, without making a commensurate increase in the maximum amount of the authorization, raised from \$341 to \$461 million the aggregate sum that may be outstanding at any one time for the purposes of the small business investment program.

Since \$1,645 million have already been appropriated to the revolving fund, the existing authorization maximum of \$1,721 million limits further appropriations to \$76 million. It is entirely possible, in view of the unexpected number and magnitude of recent physical disasters, including hurricane Betsy, that a supplemental appropriation of more than \$76 million may be required in the near future to enable SBA to provide assistance to disaster victims and, at the same time, continue at planned levels the other important loan programs conducted by the Agency.

The provisions of the bill, adding \$120 million to the \$1,721 figure, would have the twofold effect of eliminating the described discrepancy and providing a wider margin of safety against the contingencies of the disaster loan program.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11306

A bill to amend the Small Business Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "\$1,721,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,841,000,000".

RECENT BANK FAILURES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years, 14 commercial banks around the country have failed. The number of these failures is large and surprising, especially following the long postwar period when only 2 or 3 failures a year were occurring.

Of course, these 14 failures do not indicate a great weakness in our economy as the bank failures of the 1920's and 1930's so well pointed to, but the actual failures do cause us to pause and take a hard look at the present banking situation. In the following article, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, the failures were traced to four factors: Changes in ownership for ulterior motives, misuse of certificates of deposits, bad loans, bad checks, and uncollectible cash items.

Our Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, of which I am chairman, has looked into one of these failures, the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News,

Va. The results of our hearings showed that irresponsible management, misuse of certificates of deposits, and most unfortunate, I believe, the influx of criminal elements into the bank's operation caused the failure. The criminal element appeared in a number of other recent bank failures and this fact alone should cause much concern in the banking community.

Mr. Speaker, we should not dismiss even the smallest bank failure since its failure causes tragedy to the community. There is a pattern to these failures, and I believe that Members of Congress and the public should not dismiss bank failures as some fluke. Because the recent failures did not result from economic downturns should not cause us to be unconcerned about our banking structure. I feel that the advent of criminals into banking is as dangerous to banks and the public as an economic downturn.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article appearing in the September Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond following my remarks:

RECENT BANK FAILURES—WHY?

For the first time in a generation, bank failures in the United States have recently occupied a prominent place in the news. Fourteen banks have failed in the past 2 years. Coming after a lengthy period in which bank failures averaged only three or four per year, the increase in the failure rate has attracted widespread attention. Two congressional committees have become sufficiently concerned to institute investigations. A perspective on these recent failures, however, should quickly dispel any fears for the soundness of the banking system.

In contrast with the epidemic of bank suspensions in the 1920's and 1930's, the recent closing do not involve a substantial fraction of the banking industry and are not the result of weakness in the economic environment. Each of the recent failures was due to conditions related primarily to the individual bank involved. They are all traceable to one or more of four major factors: Changes in ownership for ulterior motives, misuse of certificates of deposit, bad loans, and bad checks or other uncollectible cash items. In almost every case two or more of these factors were present.

CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP

Of the 14 recently failed banks, 8 changed hands shortly before encountering difficulty, 2 of them twice within a few months. In another the ownership of the stock was not as represented in its charter application. In each case, failure was directly related to the change in ownership. Some of the new owners were inept in the field of banking. Others apparently bought control of banks for the purpose of deliberately milking them of their assets. Most of the banks involved were relatively small but large enough to make internal looting attractive to the unscrupulous.

One bank with assets of \$7 million had been operated in a very conservative manner for years and was perfectly sound until two persons with no previous experience in banking bought a majority of the stock and took over early in 1963. Through a series of loans and investments in their own interests, they drained the bank of over \$1 million in less than 6 weeks. With some of the money they paid off indebtedness they had incurred to purchase the bank stock. Losses resulting from these transactions quickly exceeded the bank's capital and as a result it was placed in receivership.

In the same year the downfall of another bank with \$30 million of assets was brought

about in a similar manner. A group of amateur bankers acquired control through the purchase of controlling stock and directed bank funds to their own use. Some \$900,000 of the bank's funds were used to repay loans with which the bank stock had been purchased. Within 4 months the new owners had expanded loans by \$5 million. The diversion of bank funds for the benefit of the majority stockholders and their friends, relatives, and associates resulted in losses exceeding the bank's capital and it was closed in August of 1963.

A third small bank was exploited by two speculators in a somewhat more imaginative manner. These individuals first acquired control of the \$2.5 million bank through relatively modest stock purchases, then hired money brokers to sell for the bank over \$1 million in certificates of deposit. The certificates were sold to 23 savings and loan associations, each of which received a premium payment from the money brokers over and above the permissible interest rate. The two speculators then purchased \$970,000 of inferior real estate mortgages at a sizable discount and sold them to the bank at only slightly less than the face value. Plans to market another \$900,000 of questionable mortgages to the bank in a similar manner were thwarted by the closing of the bank.

Most of the banks which failed recently met their downfall at the hands of two or more get-rich-quick partners, but one small midwestern bank was undermined solely by one man who purchased controlling interest and subsequently assumed the presidency despite the fact that he had no banking experience. Although the bank was an old one, it had assets of less than \$1.5 million, which facilitated one-man control. The new president began paying checks drawn by other firms he controlled, without charging the drawers' accounts. The deficit was covered with forged notes. The president also caused the bank to extend questionable loans to his other corporate interests. When the directors objected, they were all replaced. He then marketed certificates of deposit in the amount of \$100,000 through a money broker by paying a 1-percent bounty in excess of the maximum legal interest rate. Only \$40,000 of the certificates of deposit were entered in the books of the bank as deposit liabilities, with the remaining \$60,000 being used to eliminate from the books the loss items resulting from loans to his other businesses. These and similar actions quickly resulted in insolvency, and the bank was placed in receivership.

A much more complex series of events led to the failure of a west coast bank with assets slightly over \$2.5 million. In 1961, an out-of-town couple bought control of the bank, which had served the small town in which it was located for several decades. Under the new management, the bank's assets quickly mushroomed to more than five times their former level. Profits in 1962 were almost as great as total capital and surplus in 1961, although the economy of the community had not changed significantly. The bank's explosive growth was due to large deposits placed by a money order firm partially controlled by the new owners, and to lending operations outside the area.

The money order firm, operated on borrowed money, fell into difficulties and the bank was sold to help meet ensuing demands. Shortly thereafter, the money order firm was also sold, and most of the firm's deposits were withdrawn from the bank. The second new owner of the bank had expected to increase deposits still further by selling certificates of deposit to savings and loan associations through money brokers, but news of the bank's relationship with the defunct money order firm made new deposits difficult to obtain. The bank paid as much as 2½ percent above the legally permissible rate on time deposits to attract funds. Meanwhile,

many of the bank's loans were going bad. In 1962 and 1963 the bank had written off 20 percent of its total loans outstanding, but in 1964 the situation was even worse, and in July 1964, the bank was found to be insolvent and the directors voted to place it in liquidation.

UN SOUND MANAGEMENT

Changes of ownership did not figure in six other bank failures of the past 2 years, but each of these cases involved serious errors of judgment or fraudulent practices on the part of existing management.

The largest of these banks, established in 1962, acquired assets of \$54 million in less than 3 years of operation. Rapid growth was accomplished through a combination of deposits attracted by premiums above legal interest rates and questionable loans for which sizable fees were collected. At the time of closing the bank had over \$20 million of certificates of deposit outstanding. Some of these deposits had been secured by the payment of additional compensation of as much as 3 percent above the maximum legal rate. Many of the loans were made to real estate speculators, who paid fees of as much as \$120,000 for the privilege of borrowing. The bank encountered liquidity difficulties when many of its certificates of deposit matured within a short span of time and were not renewed. Those difficulties were dealt with for a time through borrowing at the District Federal Reserve Bank, but the true condition of the bank eventually was discovered and operations were suspended by the authorities.

A much smaller bank, with assets of slightly over \$8 million at the time it was closed, apparently came to grief as a result of the company it kept and the gullibility of some of its officers. The management permitted three money order companies, purportedly owned by the same group, to draw on uncollected funds, and a junior officer of the bank entered credits in the amount of over \$200,000 to partially cover the deficiencies. Substantial losses were also incurred through overdrafts, and through loans of approximately \$2 million to borrowers who were not creditworthy. Some of the funds used in these operations were raised through the issue of certificates of deposit at premiums above the maximum legal rate on time deposits.

Three other small banks were ruined by the misdeeds of individuals. The largest of these had resources of slightly over \$7 million. The president of this bank acquired money to pay gambling debts by fraudulently advancing money to himself on notes signed by others. The second bank, with resources of \$600,000, made the mistake of honoring a large number of worthless checks drawn by one of its customers. The third, with total resources of only \$75,000, was declared insolvent when an unrecorded deposit liability of \$380,000 was discovered.

Perhaps the most glaring example of bank manipulation was uncovered in the collapse of a \$3 million bank only a few months old. A group of small businessmen, including the president of a bank in another town, joined together to acquire a Federal charter for the bank. They were to invest about \$300,000 of their own money and borrow the rest of the initial capitalization of \$500,000. But before the bank opened its doors in April of 1963, control had been taken over through the acquisition of 51 percent of the stock by another man who had not been one of the original charter applicants.

Most of the new capital was borrowed from a nearby bank with stock in the first bank pledged as collateral. Since the amount involved was several times the lending bank's legal limit, the loan could not legally be made directly to a single man. To meet this situation, the loan was divided

between the majority stockholder, the president of the bank he was buying into, and three others, with an agreement that the new bank would maintain a compensating balance of \$400,000 in the lending bank.

Of the newly organized bank's capitalization of \$500,000, only about \$12,000 was unencumbered cash. Pressure to increase deposits led the organizers of the new bank to pay as much as 6 percent interest on certificates of deposit.

Early in the bank's brief history, \$225,000 was withdrawn by the promoters through a complicated series of operations involving forged notes. These notes were then paid and additional money withdrawn through the use of seven new notes totaling \$315,000 in the names of people who knew nothing about them or in fictitious names.

Shortly thereafter, the principals involved acquired control of another small bank through the use of additional doubtful notes. When they arranged to have \$200,000 transferred to the first bank, an employee notified the State Banking Commissioner, who required return of the funds. But later, \$400,000 was successfully transferred and most of it disbursed before it could be returned. Under pressure from the Commissioner, loans were transferred to cover most of the losses.

The difficulties of the bank were compounded by the seizure of \$1 million of counterfeit securities by the FBI when the bank's president and principal stockholder attempted to market them. Some months after the seizure of these securities, the bank which had advanced funds to the promoters for the original capital foreclosed on the stock pledged as collateral and took over the bank. This led to investigations which resulted in the bank being declared insolvent by the FDIC, and 1 month later, it was ordered closed by the Comptroller of the Currency.

NEW LEGISLATION

All the recent failures had one thing in common. They were the result of efforts on the part of one or more individuals to use the assets, and in some instances, the money-raising potential, of commercial banks for personal gain. In a few cases, the individuals were from outside the banks involved, but all too often, they bought into the bank and undermined it from within. It is because of this, as evidenced by the cases described above, that Congress amended the Federal Deposit Insurance Act in late 1964 to require the chief executive officer of every insured bank to report to the appropriate Federal banking authority any change in ownership of the bank stock resulting in a change in control of the bank. The act also requires all insured banks to report loans secured by 25 percent or more of the stock of any insured bank. After a change in control, the bank is required to report to the appropriate Federal banking agency any changes in the chief executive officer or directors during the following year, and to provide a statement of the past and present business affiliations of the new chief executive officer or directors. This law does not eliminate the possibility of banks being taken over by unscrupulous operators, but it may discourage them, and certainly should alert the banking community to the danger.

Much attention has been focused recently on changes in capital-assets ratios and loan-to-deposit ratios, and on changes in the balance sheet structure of banks. Questions have been raised concerning the possible deterioration of loan quality and excessive liberality in lending. But all of this concern is with the possibility of marginal errors in judgment by bankers. In the banks that failed, there was no wide range of marginal error. Either the bank was deliberately looted from within or the banker took risks which were well outside the scope of prudent banking.

Bank suspensions

	1921-29										1930-32			
	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	Total	1930	1931	1932	Total
Capital stock of:														
\$25,000 and less.....	301	217	446	511	376	628	413	302	382	3,576	767	1,058	737	2,562
\$25,001 to \$49,999.....	36	41	47	59	43	102	65	39	65	497	142	220	140	502
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	83	56	92	124	131	167	121	96	120	990	219	457	294	970
\$100,000 to \$199,999.....	47	25	32	59	46	48	48	45	58	408	132	284	144	560
\$200,000 to \$999,999.....	16	15	16	16	18	15	15	11	20	142	70	227	126	423
\$1,000,000 and over.....	3								6	9	11	32	11	54
Not available.....	19	13	13	6	4	16	7	6	8	92	11	16	4	31
Total.....	505	367	646	775	618	976	669	499	659	5,714	1,352	2,294	1,456	5,102

Source: Federal Reserve Board, Annual Report, 1932.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The United States entered the decade of the 1920's with more banks than any country has ever had before or since. The Nation's bank chartering policies over a long period had led to the establishment of a large number of small, weak banks. Many States had very liberal chartering provisions, some allowing new banks to be established with as little as \$5,000 capital. Prior to the turn of the century, a Federal charter required a minimum of \$50,000 capital, and in 1899, there were 10,283 State banks and only 3,617 national banks. But in 1900, national banking laws were revised to permit banks to be chartered by the Federal Government with a capital stock of as little as \$25,000 in communities of 3,000 inhabitants or less. Passage of this age was followed by a sharp increase in the issuance of both State and national charters. By 1921, there were 8,154 national and 22,658 State banks, a total of 30,812, or more than twice the number in operation today. Many of the new banks were small and weak, but due to the generally high level of prosperity, especially in agricultural areas, failures were relatively rare. In the two decades prior to 1921, about 85 banks per year closed their doors. Beginning in 1921, the failure rate increased sharply, and 5,714 banks suspended operations in the next 9 years; most of them permanently.

Most of the suspended banks were small country banks with assets of less than \$1 million. They had been chartered in a period of farm prosperity and rising land prices. Many of their loans were in the form of mortgages on farm real estate. Agriculture became overexpanded during World War I, and after the war, farm prices and the value of farm land fell sharply. With greatly reduced incomes, many farmers were unable to meet payments on bank loans. The accelerated movement of rural population to the cities further weakened banks in rural areas. Thousands of banks failed, but due perhaps to the general prosperity the failures caused no panic.

The panic came later when city banks began failing in even larger numbers. The banking collapse of the early 1930's had its roots in the 1920's. As nonagricultural prosperity increased, banks increased their loan-deposit ratios and made larger and larger numbers of demand and call loans secured by shares of stock. Banks assumed that these loans would provide liquidity, and in fact most of the open market call loans were repaid. But when the stocks with which the demand loans to individual customers were secured rapidly lost value during and after the crash of 1929, it was discovered that many of these loans were uncollectible. Borrowers who in other times might have shifted loans to another bank in order to repay the original lender found almost all banks attempting to call their loans simultaneously.

Today, a shortage of liquidity for the banking system as a whole could be countered by Federal Reserve action. Federal Reserve banks may provide additional re-

serves directly to banks through various kinds of advances, or indirectly through open market operations. But prior to 1932 this was not the case. Member banks could borrow from Federal Reserve banks only on collateral consisting of narrowly defined "eligible" paper and open market operations were in a rudimentary stage of development. Thus, thousands of banks found themselves in an illiquid position and were unable to survive the waves of bank runs of the next few years. Between 1929 and 1934, more than 9,000 banks closed their doors, and very few were able to reopen.

In today's economic environment, the general collapse of our financial structure seems impossible. The banking system is altogether different and much stronger than in the 1920's and early 1930's. There are fewer small, weak banks, mainly because capital requirements are higher and bank charters are more difficult to obtain. The average bank today is older and larger, and most bank deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Knowledge of that insurance prevents the sort of bank runs which closed many banks in the early 1930's.

Number of commercial banks closed because of financial difficulties, 1933-64

1933.....	4,000
1934.....	61
1935.....	32
1936.....	72
1937.....	83
1938.....	79
1939.....	71
1940.....	49
1941.....	16
1942.....	23
1943.....	5
1944.....	2
1945.....	1
1946.....	2
1947.....	6
1948.....	3
1949.....	9
1950.....	5
1951.....	5
1952.....	4
1953.....	5
1954.....	4
1955.....	5
1956.....	3
1957.....	3
1958.....	9
1959.....	3
1960.....	2
1961.....	9
1962.....	3
1963.....	2
1964.....	10

Sources: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

There is still the possibility of additional failures due to dishonesty or ineptitude on the part of management. Out of more than 13,000 banks, it is not surprising that a handful should suffer management difficulties. By comparison with the failure rate among other firms of similar size, the bank failure

rate is very low indeed. New legislation and renewed efforts of regulatory agencies may reduce the rate even further in the future.

CONSUMERS PROFIT FROM EXCISE TAX REDUCTION IN MONTH OF AUGUST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the monuments of President Johnson's Great Society is the continued growth of economic prosperity, and no small part of this progress has been played by the reduction of income taxes and, very recently, excise taxes.

It is with an eye toward the little people, the small businessman, and the average salaried worker that the Great Society has guided its continued economic success. No country can be economically prosperous unless the successes are enjoyed by all.

In a report to the President, the Council of Economic Advisers shows that for the month of August nine-tenths of the \$1.7 billion excise tax cut has been passed on to the consumers in the form of lower retail prices. This report confirms the sense of Congress that industry should pass on the tax savings to the consumer instead of retaining these savings. The excise tax reduction will increase the demand for consumer products, thereby furthering our economic expansion. It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the passing on of these excise tax reductions by industry to the consumers is wholly voluntary.

Mr. Speaker, I include the report of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Record following my remarks:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON EXCISE TAX REDUCTION FROM THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

In August, nine-tenths of the \$1.7 billion excise tax cut was being passed on to consumers through lower retail prices. This is an improvement over July, when three-fourths of the reduction had been passed on.

Substantially more retail dealers cut their prices by the full amount of the tax reduction in August than in July. Items for which price reduction was virtually complete in July included women's handbags, men's wrist watches, home permanent kits, and new automobiles. Nearly complete pass on of the tax cuts was also achieved in August on

typewriters, adding machines, and optional retailers-installed auto equipment.

Some 60 to 80 percent of all retail dealers were fully passing on the tax cuts on room air conditioners, television sets, refrigerator-freezers, ranges, and movie cameras. On most of these items, more dealers fully passed on the tax cuts in August than in July. The majority of retailers of small radio-TV replacement tubes and of playing cards were not yet given the consumer the benefits of lower prices.

Those manufacturers who had raised prices by July to obtain all or part of the benefits of the tax reduction did not reduce them in August. Manufacturers of pens and mechanical pencils and matches, and some man-

ufacturers of golf equipment raised their prices by the amount of the tax, leaving the total price (including tax) paid by the retailers unchanged, and preventing any pass-through to consumers. Manufacturers' prices of phonograph records net of tax were raised by about half the amount of the tax reduction, limiting the possible pass-through to consumers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is continuing to collect detailed price information at the request of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Treasury Department, covering a representative group of the items on which excise taxes were cut. Next month's report will cover many additional items.

The attached table summarizes the results.

TABLE 1.—Approximate percentage of sellers who passed on Federal excise tax cut by August 1965

	Retailers ¹			Percentage of manufacturers who passed on tax cut
	Completely passed on tax cut	Partially passed on tax cut	Did not pass on tax cut	
Retailers' excise tax:				
Women's handbags.....	100	(2)		
Men's wrist watches.....	100	(2)		
Home permanent kit.....	95		5	
Manufacturers' excise tax:				
New automobiles.....	100			100
Optional auto equipment (factory installed).....	100		(2)	100
Air conditioners.....	80	(2)	20	100
Television sets.....	80	(2)	20	100
Refrigerator-freezers.....	75	(2)	25	100
Ranges.....	60	5	35	100
Movie cameras.....	60	5	35	95
Typewriters.....	95	5	(2)	100
Adding machines.....	95	5	(2)	100
Small TV replacement tubes.....	40	5	55	100
Phonograph records.....	(3)	(3)	(3)	(4)
Golf equipment.....	(3)	(3)	(3)	30
Pens and mechanical pencils.....	(3)	(3)	(3)	0
Matches.....	(3)	(3)	(3)	0
Stamp tax: Playing cards.....	30	15	55	100

¹ Based on a nationwide sample of retailers.

² Less than 5 percent.

³ Not available.

⁴ Excise tax was partially passed on by all major manufacturers.

THE HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, for half a century or more the United States has pressed forward on a highway construction program designed to make travel far more pleasant and swift for the American people. The interstate highway program will in a few short years add another 41,000 miles to the present network and will bring about still another dramatic revolution in driving speed and comfort.

The curious thing about this program, so important to the creation of a better life for our people, is that it has bred long stretches of the most incredible ugliness. In almost any State one can drive mile after mile seeing only billboards and junkyards with all of the natural scenery completely obliterated.

These conditions are not the inevitable result of the road program. Far from it. They have occurred only because we have been so intent on improving our technology that we have been blind to

the need for conserving the natural advantages we already possess.

That has become an all too common mistake in this country. Fortunately it is not too late to correct this particular error. And it is equally fortunate that we have a President and First Lady who care just as deeply about the preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of this country as they do about the improvement of its technology.

The bill that will be before us, in short, is an essential part of the administration's conservation and natural beauty enhancement programs. By 1970 it will effect the removal of adjacent billboards and the removal or screening of junkyards along our interstate and primary highways. It will do so with fair compensation to all concerned.

We should have begun this program 50 years ago. Our failure to do so makes the task ahead harder but not impossible. And with scenic land of priceless value being gobbled up each day for billboards and junkyards we cannot afford to delay any longer. The administration's bill deserves our support.

As with all conservation programs, this program is not without opposition. Such programs are for the public good and they frequently interfere with private profit. Unfortunately some of those who find profit in ugliness and the de-

struction of scenic beauty have not confined themselves to arguing against the bill but have engaged in a campaign of ridicule directed against President and Mrs. Johnson because of their interest in preserving the scenic beauty of this country. That campaign deserves no answer but it prompts the comment that when the day comes that it is ridiculous to wish to preserve the natural beauty of this country that has inspired the Nation's patriots and poets for almost 2 centuries, then something has gone out of the spirit of our country.

The first family deserves praise, not ridicule, for the leadership they have shown in this area and coming generations of Americans will be grateful for their pioneering efforts.

The arguments against the program are the usual ones, primarily that the program is too costly whereas it does not require a penny to ruin the countryside. There is, however, one interesting twist to these arguments and that is that the bill is unconstitutional because the Federal Government allegedly lacks power to condemn land for esthetic purposes. Like other arguments raised against the bill, this has no substance whatever.

For if there is one issue on which the Supreme Court is united it is that the Federal Government has the very power the opponents of the present bill claim it lacks. The issue was disposed of in 1954 by a unanimous Court in *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 28.

In that case, the power of the Congress to enact the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 was challenged on the ground that Congress could authorize the taking of land for the purpose of removing slums but not "merely to develop a better balanced, more attractive community."

The Supreme Court thought otherwise. It held that:

The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive. . . . The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, esthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patrolled.

And the Court went on to say that:

If those who govern the District of Columbia decide that the Nation's Capital should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way.

Having made this point, the Court ruled that once it is recognized that the objective is within the authority of Congress, "the right to realize it through the exercise of eminent domain is clear."

The path is therefore clear, both as a matter of constitutional law and as a subject of legislative policy. We owe it to our people throughout this great country of ours and to the generations which follow us to proceed without detour or delay to pass the bill that will soon be before us, so that we will have taken another step toward leaving future generations of Americans, in President Johnson's words, "a glimpse of the world as God really made it, not just as it looked when we got through with it."

STOP ANTELOPE-KILLING SHEEP FENCING ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED GRAZING LANDS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the deer and the antelope will not be playing for very much longer on the Western range unless the Department of the Interior will move to stop sheep ranchers on Government land in Wyoming and other Western States from crisscrossing the land with fences. These fences are causing the death of countless antelope. I have photographs of antelope dying after they become impaled on barbed wire fences, and the bleached bones of other antelope lying at the base of the fences.

According to Mr. Tom Bell, president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, the Wyoming antelope herd is "definitely threatened by a sheep-tight fence." Since 1963, to save themselves the cost of hiring shepherds, sheep ranchers with grazing permits on Government lands have been building sheep-tight fencing across the public domain. Antelope need a wide range in order to survive—they must move up to water during the summer, and move down in winter to escape from snow and storms. If sheep-tight fences are built along the antelope's migration routes, the antelope become entangled in the wire and die.

Sheep ranchers are allowed to use the public domain for the nominal fee of 6 cents per sheep per month. Starting in 1963, in order to save the expense of employing shepherders, the sheepmen have been erecting sheep-tight fences in the Wyoming public domain. Proposed fencing of the antelope range continues. For example, the Diamond Ring Ranch Co. of Casper, Wyo., currently proposes to build a fence on Government land 23 miles long, enclosing some 17,500 acres, in what Mr. Bell calls "an area vital to the maintenance of what was once one of the finest antelope herds in Wyoming."

Mr. Bell continues:

We have no right to criticize a private fence on private land, but when large blocks of public land are concerned, I believe we're right to assert our claims. The large blocks of public land are very important not only to wildlife interests but to all outdoor recreation interest. It is up to the public to decide whether they are going to enjoy the use of something which belongs to all of us, or completely turn the public lands over to the stockmen who now control them.

Already, the indiscriminate fencing of the public range has had its effect on the antelope herd. Wyoming Game and Fish Commission antelope permits for the Poison Spider, the Lower Sweetwater, and the North Natrona hunting areas totaled 4,200 in 1963, before sheep-tight fencing started. In 1965, only 1,600 permits were issued, a drop of 2,600.

America the beautiful has recently seen too many duck marshes destroyed

by the farm drainage dragline, too many trout streams ruined by the highway bulldozer. I do not want to see the American antelope go the way of the passenger pigeon. Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 11359 directing the Secretary of the Interior to ban from the public lands any fence which impedes the movement of wildlife. If the Secretary finds a grazing licensee has built such a fence, he shall require it to be removed by the licensee, and shall see that it is removed at the licensee's expense if the licensee fails to remove it himself within 30 days. Any future illegal fencing shall be the cause for a revocation of the grazing license.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A PERPETUAL NONPROFIT CORPORATION TO BE KNOWN AS THE CRADLE OF FORESTRY IN AMERICA, INC.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a bill to establish a perpetual nonprofit corporation to be known as the Cradle of Forestry in America, Inc., was introduced by me a few minutes ago. The purpose of the corporation is to provide advice and cooperation to the Secretary of Agriculture in developing, administering, and operating the Cradle of Forestry in America which is located in the Pink Beds section of the Pisgah National Forest, near Asheville, N.C., in my congressional district where professional forestry was first taught and practiced in this country.

The corporation may expect to receive many items of historic significance and other donations which will help develop and tell the story of American forestry conservation.

The Pink Beds came into prominence in 1890. It was here that George W. Vanderbilt employed America's first recognized forester, European-trained Gifford Pinchot, to conduct a scientific practice of forestry and conservation which attracted national attention. It was here that the first field school of forestry in America was located. It was near here that the first tract of national forest land was purchased under the Weeks law.

Mr. Pinchot was succeeded in 1895 by a German forester, Dr. Carl A. Schenck, a gifted and enthusiastic forester who ably carried on the program.

It was outstanding leaders like Mr. Vanderbilt, Mr. Pinchot, and Dr. Schenck, supported by key citizens across the land which led to the establishment of not only the Pisgah National Forest, but the U.S. Forest Service. Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has visited the Pink Beds and expressed strong support for this entire project. A visitor center has already been built by the Forest Service. A replica of the schoolhouse where Dr.

Schenck held the first forestry classes will be started soon and financed by the alumni of the school.

The master development plan includes a museum and outdoor displays telling the story of forestry and conservation in a setting where these key events took place and in a setting unsurpassed in climate and magnificent scenery where the Blue Ridge Parkway, the Smoky Mountains National Park, and the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests lead all other comparable Federal areas in annual visitations.

I see this Cradle of Forestry as a unique National Forest Conservation shrine, visited by millions of citizens each year and constituting a worthwhile investment, educationally and conservationwise.

The bill names an executive board of 15 outstanding citizens who have a strong interest in and dedication to forestry. I believe that this citizen participation will contribute greatly to the ultimate success of the project. I was pleased that each individual who was asked to serve on the Board agreed to accept the responsibility. I commend them on their public spirit and willingness to serve present and future generations through conservation. Their well-known accomplishments, diverse talents and background, wide interests and experiences will serve to help focus national attention on the cradle project.

The Board members are as follows:

Mr. John Parris, of Sylva, chairman of the Parks Committee of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development and one of the original promoters of the project;

Mr. Francis W. Sargent, of Boston, chairman of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, former executive director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission;

Mr. Verne Rhoades of Asheville, first supervisor of Pisgah National Forest and a graduate of Dr. Schenck's original Biltmore Forestry School;

Mr. Reuben B. Robertson of Asheville, former chairman of the board of Champion Papers, Inc. When the Biltmore Forestry School left the Vanderbilt estate, it was located temporarily on Champion property. Mr. Robertson is known for his lifelong promotion of sound forestry practices;

Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor of Washington, D.C., president of the National Geographic Society, and a member of the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments;

Mrs. Marian S. Heiskell of New York City, director of special activities of the New York Times and a member of the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments;

Mr. Arthur Loeb of Pisgah Forest, vice president of Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. A strong conservationist, Mr. Loeb is an outdoorsman who has frequently walked the trails through the Cradle site;

Mr. George H. V. Cecil of the Biltmore estate, Asheville. A conservationist himself, Mr. Cecil is a grandson of the late George Vanderbilt, upon whose estate the first forestry school was founded;

Mr. Voit Gilmore of Southern Pines, State senator, lumberman, and former director of the U.S. Travel Service;

The Honorable William O. Douglas of Washington, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a noted writer, conservationist, outdoorsman and hiker. Justice Douglas has visited the Cradle and expressed personal interest in it;

Mr. Frank Brown of Cullowhee, president of the North Carolina National Park, Parkway, and Forest Development Commission, and one of the first advocates of the project;

Mr. John Veach, Sr., of Asheville, lumberman, conservationist and president of the Hardwood Corp., of America;

Mr. Joseph Penfold of Washington, national conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America;

Dr. R. J. Preston of Raleigh, dean of the department of forestry at North Carolina State College;

Mr. Ken Pomeroy of Washington, chief forester, American Forestry Association. He has visited the Cradle and taken a personal interest in the project.

H.R. 11242 AMENDS THE SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 11242 is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. I desire to make a brief explanation of its purpose:

In 1962 the Congress enacted the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962, which is popularly known as the Keogh-Smathers Act. The legislation recognized the need and equity of providing a tax benefit to the self-employed who set up retirement plans for themselves and their employees. Prior to this legislation, liberalized treatment was accorded only retirement plans set up by corporations for their employees.

Since most professional groups, such as doctors, lawyers, and accountants, were prevented by State legislation or by codes of ethics of their respective professions from incorporating, they were unable to benefit from the liberalized tax treatment available to corporate retirement plans. For other groups, such as farmers, it is not customary for most of them to incorporate. Thus, the existing law discriminated against professional and other self-employed groups. Yet a strong need for some favorable treatment for them existed.

Recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging demonstrated that few plans have been adopted since the enactment of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962. The limited use of the plans has been attributed to the severe restrictions and limitations that were provided in the act.

Testimony presented during the hearings before the Senate subcommittee indicated that "only 15,000 persons have been covered whereas the Treasury Department estimated that 185,000 persons would be covered in the first year alone." This fact illustrates the compelling need to modify present law in order to carry out more effectively and successfully the intent of both Congress and the sponsors of the legislation. Thus, I have introduced a bill that will provide the necessary remedial legislation. Under my bill two basic changes will be made in the present tax treatment of self-employed individuals. These are discussed below.

As background for a clearer understanding of my proposed amendments, I will briefly review certain provisions of the 1962 legislation.

An owner-employee—that is one who has over 10-percent interest in the business—may contribute to a retirement plan the lesser of first, 10 percent of his earned income, or second, \$2,500. However, only 50 percent of the contribution may be deducted from income for tax purposes. Thus, the maximum contribution may be \$2,500, but only \$1,250 may be deducted by the taxpayer in computing his income tax liability.

The self-employed who are not owner-employees are not limited in the amount they may contribute to a plan—provided such contributions are in accordance with a nondiscriminatory plan. However, in computing their income tax, they may deduct only half—50 percent—of the amount of the lesser of first, 10 percent of their earned income, or second, \$2,500. Thus, their maximum deduction is limited to \$1,250, the same as for owner-employees.

One of my proposed amendments would repeal the 50-percent restriction on the deduction of the contribution. Thus, if a self-employed individual contributes \$2,500 to a retirement plan, the full amount would be deductible.

During the hearings before the Senate subcommittee, one witness, who is a college professor of insurance and actuarial mathematics and has a working background in social security, testified that the 50-percent limitation was the major drawback in the utilization of the retirement plans.

My bill would also remove the limitation on the amount of the individual's income that may be regarded as earned income if it is derived from both personal services and capital. Present law provides that where both capital and personal services are material income-producing factors in the trade or business, not more than 30 percent of the net earnings of the taxpayer from the trade or business may qualify as earned income. However, if the net earnings are \$2,500 or less the entire amount may be regarded as earned income. This 30-percent factor severely reduces the benefit of a plan for those taxpayers, because the amount that may be contributed to a retirement plan is based on earned income. Moreover, it is unrealistic. For example, in the case of farmers, the percent of income attributable to labor is usually far above 30 percent. My bill

will remove this arbitrary 30-percent factor.

My bill, if enacted, will help to more fully accomplish the original objectives of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act. It will foster the adoption of retirement plans for the self-employed. And it will provide greater equity for the treatment of the self-employed as compared with corporate employees who are covered by corporate retirement plans.

QUESTIONABLE USE OF UNILATERAL FORCE TO PREVENT A COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF A LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRY

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when the House considered House Resolution 560, condoning the unilateral use of force to prevent a Communist takeover of a Latin American country, some Members said this would produce strong anti-American outbursts among our southern neighbors.

This prediction, as we have seen, has been fulfilled. There have been both unofficial and official expressions of dismay and anger.

Among these is a resolution of the Senate of Colombia rejecting "the return to the policy of the 'big stick.'"

The Members may be interested in the actual wording of the Colombian resolution as translated by the Legislative Reference Service:

The Senate of the Republic holds that under the collective security system the defense of all countries of the hemisphere is sufficiently guaranteed against any intracontinental or extracontinental aggression. Consequently repudiates any unilateral military action for deeming it overtly regressive and contrary to the inter-American juridical and political system.

Likewise expresses its surprise at the proposal of the U.S. House which represents a return to the less pleasant eras of Yankee imperialism against which the rest of America fought until it was overcome. The Senate of the Republic rejects the return to the policy of the "big stick" and proclaims once again its adhesion to the principle of non-intervention. Likewise, the Senate requests the leadership of the Latin American Parliament of all Latin American Congresses on the purpose of jointly defining the position ment to call an extraordinary meeting for resolution approved by the U.S. House.

THE KAY SAGE TANGUY BEQUEST TO MUSEUM OF MODERN ART IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Kay Sage Tanguy's magnificent bequest to the Museum of Modern Art went on exhibition at the museum building in New York on September 17 for a showing that will continue through November 28. Mrs. Tanguy, a distinguished painter in her own right, was the wife of Yves Tanguy, the noted surrealist. Mr. and Mrs. Tanguy lived for 10 years in Woodbury, Conn., and Mrs. Tanguy resided there until her death in 1963. Mrs. Tanguy was such a unique individual that I think it worthwhile to include herewith the press release about her collection which was issued by the Museum of Modern Art on September 16. I hope that many Americans who are interested in the arts will take the opportunity to visit this outstanding collection which was assembled through the dedication and perceptiveness of an outstanding American and was through her generosity made available to the people of this country.

The press release follows:

KAY SAGE TANGUY BEQUEST SHOWN AT
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Thirty-six works of art selected from a group of nearly 100 bequeathed in 1963 to the Museum of Modern Art at 11 West 53d Street, New York, by the American painter, Kay Sage Tanguy, will be on exhibition in the museum's Recent Acquisitions Gallery from September 17 through November 28. In addition, several works previously given by Mrs. Tanguy will be shown, along with her own painting, "Hyphen," purchased by the Museum in 1955. The exhibition was directed by Miss Sara Mazo, assistant curator of the museum collections.

In addition to works of art from her own collection, Kay Sage Tanguy bequeathed a generous sum of money to the museum for the purchase of contemporary art. This is the largest unrestricted purchase fund that the museum has ever received.

Like many other artists, Kay Sage was an enthusiastic collector. She and her husband, Yves Tanguy, acquired the work of their friends and colleagues in Europe in the 1930's and they were chiefly of surrealist persuasion. Later the work of friends in America was added. The present exhibition contains paintings by Paul Delvaux, Max Ernst, Jean Hélion, René Magritte, Wolfgang Paalen, as well as Yves Tanguy; collages and assemblages by André Breton, Joan Miró, Kay Sage; a sculpture by Alexander Calder; and drawings by Delvaux, Frederick Kiesler, and André Masson, and Tanguy.

One of Kay Sage Tanguy's favorite paintings was the Magritte "Portrait" of 1935, a famous work by the Belgian artist which she gave to the museum in 1956. This painting had been lent by its previous owner to the museum's exhibition Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism in 1936. Two other Belgian works are included, the Delvaux oil of 1933, "The Encounter," and his large, highly finished drawing done in 1947.

Tanguy's "The Hunted Sky" of 1951 was first shown in the museum's Tanguy exhibition held in the year of his death, 1955. Of this painting James Thrall Soby wrote: "Tanguy . . . saw parts of Arizona and, like his colleague, Max Ernst, was startled by the geological phenomena of the American West, which both visited soon after their arrival here in 1939 . . . 'The Hunted Sky' assembles stony forms in mannequin-like piles, their relative uniformity of coloring relieved by stark white objects, like bits of paper blowing or settling in the arid, desert air."

André Breton's "Poem-Object" of 1941 was dedicated to Kay Sage Tanguy. The poem is an integral part of the object, which is an

assemblage, and is inscribed in paint on the background: "ces terrains vagues, où j'erre, vaincu par l'ombre, et la lune, accrochée à la maison de mon coeur" ("these wastelands, where I wander, overcome by the darkness, and the moon, hanging in the house of my heart"). In a recent letter the artist explains that this object illustrates a dramatic episode in his own life, and that the "house of my heart" is to be understood as an astrological term.

In the untitled collage of 1933 by Miró, a charcoal drawing links three postcards and various other pictures pasted on a large sheet of green paper. Calder's stable-mobile sculpture of brightly painted aluminum is small but characteristic, as are the paintings by Ernst, Hélion, and Paalen dating from the 1930's. Kay Sage's collage is one of a group of objects she made in her last years; it was included in the museum's Art of Assemblage exhibition in 1961, as was the Breton "Poem-Object."

The Kay Sage Tanguy bequest is rich in drawings, particularly those of Tanguy who is represented by 72 items, only 19 of which could be shown in the present exhibition. William S. Lieberman, curator of drawings and prints at the museum, says:

"The drawings in the bequest are of special interest for two reasons. First, they include works by other artists which Kay and Yves Tanguy collected for their own enjoyment, drawings by Delvaux, Kiesler, and Masson. Second, those by Tanguy himself offer as a group a unique opportunity to study in depth his own, remarkably unhesitant draftsman's hand, from the humorously collaborative 'cadavre exquis' of 1934 to delicately refined constructions drawn in 1949 and 1953.

"Most of the 19 drawings selected for exhibition belong to Tanguy's last years in the United States. None are preparatory studies for major works in oil or gouache. They articulate, sometimes tentatively and always in simple outline, the disquietly amorphous shapes which, modeled, contoured and grouped together, become the silent sculpture which fills the haunting vistas of his painting.

"Several of the drawings were conceived in series, and the bequest includes a complete sequence of 22 such drawings, done in 1942, in different colored inks on different colored sheets of uniform size.

"The largest drawing by Tanguy is one of his last as well as perhaps his best known. Drawn in 1953, it was reproduced by James Thrall Soby in his monograph "Yves Tanguy" published by the museum in 1955."

Katherine Linn Sage was born in 1898 in Albany, N.Y., daughter of Henry Manning Sage, a New York State senator. As a small child she was taken to Italy, where she lived, except for the years of World War I, until 1937. She lived in Paris from 1937 to 1939 and then returned to the United States. Yves Tanguy came here shortly after and they were married the following year, eventually settling in a 19th century farmhouse in Woodbury, Conn. Tanguy died there in 1955 and Kay Sage in 1963.

As a painter Kay Sage was self-taught. She first exhibited her paintings at the Surrealists in Paris in 1933, although she had had a small show in 1936 in Milan. From 1940 to 1961 she held nine one-man shows in New York, as well as one-man exhibitions at the San Francisco Museum of Art and Hartford's Wadsworth Atheneum. She took part in many national and international exhibitions both here and abroad. Her work is in the collections of the Metropolitan and Whitney Museums and the Museum of Modern Art in New York; the Art Institute of Chicago; the California Palace of the Legion of Honor in San Francisco; Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; and the Walker Art Center, Minn.

When Kay Sage returned to America in 1939 she had already planned with the approval of Yvon Delbos, French Minister of Education, a series of one-man shows in New York for artists working in Paris. Contributions and proceeds from sales were to be used to assist artists in France who were involved in the crisis of World War II. Yves Tanguy came to this country with the authorization of the French Government to inaugurate this series of exhibitions with his first one-man show in New York. Jean Hélion's was the second show of this series.

A memorial exhibition of Kay Sage's paintings and drawings will be held at the Mattatuck Museum, Waterbury, Conn., this year. It will be shown thereafter at the Albany Institute of History and Art, the Lyman Allyn Museum, New London, and at Williams and Vassar Colleges.

James Thrall Soby, chairman of the museum's committee on the museum collections, writes:

"In the house at Woodbury, Conn., which Yves and Kay Tanguy bought toward the end of World War II, there were many works of art. A few were by them but most were by friends and colleagues, chiefly of surrealist persuasion . . . It delighted both Tanguys to remember that the house had once been the village poorhouse. They had painted it white throughout the interior, yellow outside, and there were two handsome barns in back which they used as studios . . . It was apparent that Kay Tanguy was the collector in the family. At the very end of her life she talked like an excited schoolgirl about some small pre-Columbian sculptures she had bought in New York. She constantly acquired rare books and had them elaborately bound . . . Of all the works here shown Kay preferred the Magritte 'Portrait' . . . She liked almost equally the Miró, the Ernst, Breton's 'Poem-Object,' the two works by Delvaux and—naturally—everything Yves had painted."

A TRIBUTE TO HERBERT TENZER—
A MAN OF DEDICATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to express my deep appreciation to my good friend and colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman HERBERT TENZER, for the crucial role he has played in the effort to provide home rule for the District of Columbia. It was through HERBERT TENZER's initiative and leadership that all our Jewish new year services held in the Washington on Monday and Tuesday, the first 2 days of the Jewish new year season which is considered to be the most holy and solemn period in the Jewish religious calendar. This is a time when Jews all over the world join with their families to attend religious services and seek forgiveness of sins and pray for a just, peaceful, and happy new year.

HERBERT TENZER organized and made all the arrangements for these special Jewish new year services held in the prayer room of the Capitol so that our Jewish colleagues would be able to observe the new year and still attend the sessions of the House. My assistant,

who attended the services, has told me of their great beauty and solemnity.

I have great respect for HERBERT TENZER for his orthodox observance of the Jewish faith which has never stopped him from vigorously pursuing his duties as a Member of this House. I would like to quote to you HERBERT TENZER's eloquent explanation of why our Jewish colleagues chose to forgo their obvious desire to be with their families during the new year holiday in order to help provide local self-government for the 800,000 residents of our Nation's Capital:

Justice is why we're here. Justice for 800,000 people who have been denied it in the city of Washington.

As a sponsor of a bill providing home rule for the District of Columbia and as someone very much concerned that this House should speedily grant complete local self-government to the people of Washington, I want to express my deep appreciation to all the Jewish Members of this House who have each been consistent supporters of complete and meaningful home rule for the District of Columbia. Each of the following Members signed the discharge petition and supported home rule on the crucial procedural votes on Monday: Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York; SAMUEL N. FRIEDL, of Maryland; JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; CHARLES S. JOELSON, of New Jersey; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; RICHARD OTTINGER, of New York; JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, of New York; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York; JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York; HERBERT TENZER, of New York; LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois. Our esteemed colleague Congressman HERMAN TOLL, of Pennsylvania has, of course, been ill, but he took special care to be paired on Monday in support of home rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the Washington Post of Wednesday, September 29, regarding these special Jewish New Year services held in the Prayer Room in the Capitol in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

LAWMAKERS STAY FOR HOME RULE VOTE—ROSH HASHANA SERVICES ARE HELD IN CAPITOL BUILDING PRAYER ROOM

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

The strains of "Hamelech"—the King—the opening prayer of the Rosh Hashana morning service, broke the long silence of the tiny room.

The King, the Lord, sits on his throne and judges the world, the rabbi chanted in Hebrew. Before him, 11 Congressmen, 1 Senator, and a small gathering of family and friends sang with him.

It was the New Year (5726) and the day of judgment, the beginning of a period when men's deeds are weighed and his future sealed.

But for this select congregation, the scene yesterday was not the synagogue. It was the Capitol Prayer Room, a tiny enclave tucked away behind the great rotunda reserved for Congressmen who come there to meditate and pray.

The Congress, conscious of the traditional church-state separation, had made this room nondenominational. Stained glass window framed by a rounded arch depicts a young George Washington around whom is inscribed

Psalm 16:1: "Preserve me, O God: for in Thee do I put my trust." Before the window a King James Bible usually lies on a lectern, and two candelabra, with seven lights, stand on either side.

But yesterday, for the first time, the King James Bible was gone. In its place, housed in a converted bookcase representing the Holy Ark, stood two Torahs, the sacred Five Books of Moses.

"Avinu Malkenu"—Our Father, Our King, have pity on us—the rabbi sang, and the congregation, clothed in white skull caps and prayer shawls, responded.

Then, the ark was opened and the Torahs placed on the lectern. Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, approached the altar and spoke the words, "Borochu es adonoi hamvoroch"—Blessed is the name of God, He is blessed.

MULTER, a leader of the bipartisan effort on home rule for Washington, was followed to the altar by Representative HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of New York, who suggested converting the nondenominational prayer room to a synagogue for 2 days so the 13 active Jewish Congressmen could be present for the home rule debate.

Midway in the service, Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK slipped quietly into the room. He too, donned the yarmelke (the skull cap), in Orthodox and Conservative Judaism a symbol of respect in the House of the Lord.

At that point, the rabbi sounded the shofar—the ram's horn—a piercing, soprano sound that signals a call to repentance, a harbinger of the justice awaiting all mankind.

"Justice is why we're here," TENZER said during the service. "Justice for 800,000 people who have been denied it in the city of Washington."

THE MAN WHO TALKED SENSE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a brief and moving tribute to Adlai E. Stevenson's influence on American political campaigning appeared in the September 1965 issue of Fair Comment, published by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee:

When Adlai Stevenson died, most of the eulogies we read and heard took full cognizance of his contributions to political rhetoric. And, indeed, why not? Governor Stevenson brought to the national arena of politics a public address of style and grace, felicity and lucidity, that was new to the experience of living Americans. The great orators of American tradition were the stem-winders of florid imagery and scant restraint. By comparison, Stevenson set a rhetorical example that was like a single flawless emerald beside a rhinestone breastplate.

But many of the tributes to Stevenson missed two points, one intriguing, the other especially important. The smaller one first: Adlai Stevenson established a mode in 1952 which John Kennedy slipped easily into as 1960 approached. Both exemplified verbal elegance, speech proceeding from dignity, motivated by compassion and resolve, illuminated with wit and insight, touched with grace.

More substantially, Adlai Stevenson brought into American politics a great roster of decent American citizens who otherwise would have continued to inhabit the side-

lines murmuring the creed of the uninformed—"politics is a dirty business."

Stevenson's lonely voice and appeal to reason were a unique call. In response, thousands of volunteers for Stevenson sprang up, bringing into politics men and women who couldn't bring themselves to claim an unqualified party label but who could, and would, respond to Stevenson's "talking sense to the American people." Their transition into partisanship was eased by the post-1952 phrase, "Stevensonian Democrats." One heard it less frequently after a couple of years as these new partisans began to savor the stuff of politics. All this was implied in EUGENE MCCARTHY's moving identification of Stevenson at the 1960 Democratic Convention as "the man who made us all proud to be Democrats."

It might be paraphrased and extended, on some memorial plaque or marker, to include men who felt his presence without sharing his party: "the man who made us all proud to be politicians."

OUR FLOUNDERING MARITIME POLICY: A NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, this past May I spoke on the topic "What Do We Want of Our Merchant Marine?" Then, as now, I am not able to answer this very basic question. Today, no one can answer this question. Not even the Secretary of Commerce, who is charged with this responsibility, can answer it. An answer requires that there be a maritime policy, or at the very least, an administration program. We have neither a maritime policy, nor an administration program. The Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable John T. Connor, admitted this during a press conference on February 9, 1965. Speaking in connection with the Maritime Administrator's controversial speech of the same date, delivered in New Orleans, La., the Secretary stated, and I quote:

But any indication in that speech of an administration program is—first of all, I don't think there is any indication in there because there isn't any administration program at the moment.

Why are we lacking either a policy or an administration program? Well, one need only look to the events of 1961 and the ensuing years for the answer. More than 4 years of perpetual study, indecision, and constant censure have placed whatever maritime policy we might have had in a state of limbo, and dangerously adrift. But, more importantly, I point to the complete and utter lack of constructive and knowledgeable Federal leadership without which no policy ever will be effective. This deficiency is largely owing to Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961.

It was in 1961, also, that studies of our maritime policy were commenced. In April of that year the Maritime Evaluation Committee was established at the request of the then Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges. Its report was published in July 1963.

The report apparently died aborning because of its many controversial and unsound recommendations. But from recent newspaper articles concerning the unofficial release of the interagency maritime task force report, it seems that new life has been given to these concepts, presumably rejected only 2 years ago. In addition, we have had the report of the Maritime Advisory Committee. Thus, in less than 3 years we have had an equal number of differing reports concerning our maritime policy. None of these reports have been brought before the Congress. None have been nurtured to fruition. To the contrary, with the release of each report there usually have been accompanying assertions by the executive branch that such reports do not represent a new maritime policy. It is in this sea of conflicting opinion and reports that the American merchant marine has been buffeted these past 4 years. There can be little doubt that this constitutes a significant and major factor in the decay of the American merchant marine.

I have seen the American merchant marine swell in times of crisis. I have seen it shrink in times of calm. Never, however, have I seen it drift so helplessly becalmed toward utter stagnation since Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 and the ensuing 4 years of perpetual study. Meanwhile, the policy of existing law under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has been effectively frustrated and undermined. The climate of financial and economic stability so painstakingly built up over so many years, and so vital to the promotion of our merchant marine has been seriously impaired. We have been simply "backing and filling" for 4 years. All too often forgotten is the fact that indecision ultimately becomes decision through inaction.

I can only compare the ineptness of the present Maritime Administration to promote our merchant marine to the legend which grew up about the Sargasso Sea. The Sargasso Sea is a tract of the North Atlantic Ocean covered by floating seaweed. Superstitious sailors believed that ships might become enmeshed in this seaweed without being able to escape. Modern American mariners must live in equal fear of becoming becalmed in the insidious lassitude of the present Maritime Administration. The legend of the Sargasso Sea, of course, has been dispelled. However, the record of the present Maritime Administration has served only to confirm its inability to function under the existing organizational structure.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 all functions of the Maritime Administration were placed under the Department of Commerce. This inferior status of our promotional maritime agency has been the vehicle for confusion, uncertainty, and vacillation. The promotion of our merchant marine has been lost in the maze of other larger and unassociated functions for which the Secretary of Commerce is responsible. As Dr. J. Herbert Holloman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, recently observed before the

Subcommittee on Oceanography, and I quote:

It seems no more appropriate, for example, to bring physical oceanography and marine transportation together because both are related to the oceans than it does to bring geology and agriculture together because both are related to the earth.

It makes even less sense to me to place marine transportation in a subordinate position within the Department of Commerce, which, for example, is more actively concerned with public roads than with our merchant marine.

When Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 was considered, I stated then that it represented an inconsistent philosophy. On the one hand, aviation was taken out from under the Department of Commerce and provided independent status. On the other, the promotional activities of the American merchant marine were placed subordinate to the Department of Commerce. Time has borne out the fallacy of Reorganization Plan No. 7. One look at these two industries—aviation and maritime—is sufficient to attest to the wisdom of an independent agency. Aviation can look to the independent Federal Aviation Agency to promote its cause. For example, aviation is forging ahead with a highly imaginative supersonic transport program. It is estimated that this program will cost in excess of \$1 billion. The Government will underwrite about 75 percent of this cost. The American merchant marine, however, must plead with a second-rate Maritime Administration to even honor existing subsidy contracts.

There is no doubt that the organizational structure of the Maritime Administration is unique. It is unique because without recommendation, without cause, and with years of congressional studies and experience to the contrary, it embodies a castoff administrative procedure of the early thirties. It is unique, also, because it is the only major transportation agency to have gained independent status and then to have lost it. But, more importantly, it is unique because of the three-man Maritime Subsidy Board established within the Maritime Administration. It is the focus of all actions by the Maritime Administration, yet it is impotent. There is neither a statutory basis for the existence or authority of this Board, nor is there established tenure of office for its members. Its decisions are subject to review and veto by the Secretary of Commerce. All of its members are employees of the Maritime Administration. Two of the employee-members are directly subordinate to, not equal to, the Maritime Administrator, who is Chairman of the Board. As a consequence, the Maritime Subsidy Board is but one voice—that of the presidentially appointed Maritime Administrator—and two echoes. As far as I have been able to determine, there have been only three dissents by Board members, and three dissenters are no longer with the Board. And, lest you get any notion that the Board is infallible, its unanimous decisions have been

reversed on several occasions by the Secretary of Commerce.

It is to remedy this situation that I am introducing today a bill to reestablish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. This Administration would be headed by a three-man Federal Maritime Board, appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, for fixed terms of office. The Board would collectively set policy for the promotion of the American merchant marine. The Administration would implement such policy. To insure this, the Chairman of the Board would be designated as the chief executive and administrative officer of the Administration.

The Federal Maritime Administration which I propose would serve as an independent spokesman for the maritime industry. It would be able freely to promote the American merchant marine. It would be subject to closer and more effective scrutiny by the Congress. No longer would congressional inquiries be evaded by requests to clear positions with a superior agency as is so often the case now. Moreover, by virtue of its independent status, the proposed administration would have more direct contact with the offices of the President than is now the case.

The legislation I am introducing is by no means a panacea for our ailing merchant marine. It would serve, however, to complement either the existing maritime policy which is presently stalemated, or any "new policy" that may be forthcoming. I further hope that it will serve as a forum for constructive discussion among industry and labor. The time is long overdue for the removal of discussion of our maritime policy from the public forum to an appropriate congressional committee. The entire spectrum of our maritime policy and the vehicle for its implementation must be realistically explored and must result in affirmative, not dilatory, action.

Today we are in armed conflict in Vietnam without an adequate merchant fleet and without sufficient trained merchant marine personnel. The reliability of our National Defense Reserve Fleet is open to serious question. Acting as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland, has expressed his concern over this in a recent letter to the President. Foreign-flag ships have refused to carry our defense cargoes to Vietnam. These observations only serve to emphasize the need for a revitalized American merchant marine. Tomorrow Vietnam could escalate into a major conflict of Korean proportions. Or new crises could erupt in other far-flung corners of the globe requiring seagoing logistical support. We simply cannot wait until disaster dictates what we should have done. All too often in the past we have awaited the lash of necessity before acting. The path to a strong and efficient merchant marine may be long and difficult—but it is imperative that we embark on it now.

An ancient Chinese proverb notes, in part, that "A journey of a thousand miles

began with a single step." I believe that the first step in the journey to revitalizing our merchant marine is the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration as proposed in my bill. Without this first step, the American merchant marine will remain becalmed in its own Sargasso Sea—a subordinate an inept Maritime Administration.

SHUDDERING OUTLOOK OF SHIPPING AND SHIPBUILDING UNDER TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], in introducing a bill to reestablish the Maritime Administration as an independent agency of the Government.

This legislation would remove the U.S. Maritime Agency from under control of the Secretary of Commerce. Thereby the orphan status of this Agency would be eliminated in the interest of promoting the vital needs of the American merchant marine which has been suffering from neglect, uncertainty, and sheer ineptitude.

My bill is especially appropriate at this time when the shipping and shipbuilding industry, including both management and labor, are in such a furor over certain of the recent proposals contained in a Government task force report looking toward a complete revamping of U.S. maritime policy. Indeed these radical changes—especially on the Pacific coast—could be the death knell of American-flag service and likewise of our shipyards—both of which are so necessary for national defense.

My bill is designed as a first step in the direction of restoring a strong merchant marine capable of meeting growing foreign competition.

In this regard, I have written the following letter to Under Secretary of Commerce Alan Boyd which outlines my views as to the dire effects certain of the task force proposals would entail—especially on the Pacific coast:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 30, 1965.

Mr. ALAN S. BOYD,
Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation,
Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Now that the text of the interagency maritime task force proposal has been removed somewhat from the bootleg stage, perhaps some comments are in order before any official extensive changes in U.S. maritime policy are announced.

First, I must say in all frankness that I predicted in 1961 that adoption of President Kennedy's plan of placing the functions of the Maritime Administration under the Department of Commerce would relegate this agency to an inferior status. Indeed, my first suggestion is that it be reestablished as an independent agency, in order to remove

the vital needs of the American merchant marine from their orphan condition and thereby allow it to function as originally intended, to promote our vital shipping industry and welfare. Legislation to carry out this change is being introduced by me and other Members of Congress.

Meanwhile, I must point up that certain facts reveal the bleakness of the outlook for the future role of American shipping. On order, as I am informed, as of August 1, for U.S.-flag operations, were 39 dry cargo ships and one tanker, totaling 550,000 deadweight tons. In contrast, the total for Russia is 434 dry cargo ships, tankers, and bulk carriers, totaling 4 million tons.

By the same token, Norway, Japan, Great Britain, Liberia, France, and West Germany all have on order far more tonnage than the United States.

The policy established by Congress under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has been increasingly disregarded. Our fleet, although consisting of some of the finest merchant cargo ships afloat, has dwindled, and I am fearful that adoption of task force recommendations will reduce our shipbuilding capacity and our seafaring personnel far below the needs of national security.

In the spirit of constructive criticism, I want to outline the effect of the task force proposal, as I see it, on west coast shipping—which I know better—and which I believe may be quite different from the east or gulf coast situations.

While there are many features highly objectionable in the recent Interagency Maritime Task Force report, it is pertinent to point out the damaging effect several of these proposals would have on west coast shipping, if they should be promulgated. First and foremost is the proposal to pay operating subsidy only on the carriage of "commercial cargoes." The Vietnam situation is very real to the west coast U.S.-flag operators. All efforts are being made to furnish all possible space requested by the Government. Today, due to many causes, there is very little commercial cargo moving to the Far East and if the subsidized U.S. operators were forced under this proposal to only obtain subsidy payments for carrying commercial cargoes, there is no question but that our major west coast steamship companies would cease to exist overnight. And not only is this situation in the Pacific Ocean related solely to Vietnam, the Far East is for the most part composed of nations relying upon the various forms of U.S. aid and Government-sponsored cargoes. The Government cargoes are there and must be carried, if not by U.S. vessels, then by foreign-flag operators who are standing in the wings. Commercial cargoes are not sufficient in amounts to perpetuate U.S.-flag operators in the Pacific Ocean.

A second feature that would also wreak havoc is the proposal to allow foreign-built ships to be registered under the U.S. flag with all privileges extended to the U.S. operators. This would be much more than a chink in the dike to the opening of the coastwise laws. This giant step would serve to soon do away with all protection we have long deemed necessary for our domestic operators, not only along the Pacific coastline, but to Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam. This great stretch of coastline and island areas would soon be subject to the whims and charges of foreign operators. Under the proposals embodied in this task force report, not only our Nation's shipyards, but U.S.-owned steamship companies would soon disappear.

Further, the report envisions the loss of some 20,000 seafaring berths. As far as the west coast is concerned, employment for seamen and shipyard workers would be virtually nonexistent. The report tells passenger operators that they are no longer needed, that passenger ships are a relic of the past. If this is so, why is Japan and many other

maritime nations of the world now engaged in enormous construction programs to greatly increase the size of their passenger fleets?

And finally, one issue that causes grave concern to me, coming from the Pacific Northwest, is the proposal to eliminate the trade routes concept and say to all operators, "Go wherever you can to find commercial cargoes." Our port of Seattle would unquestionably be seriously damaged in that the operators now furnishing a regularly scheduled service into this great port could no longer set scheduled arrivals and departures, but would be forced to constantly search all the western ports for cargoes on a "carry it where you can find it" basis.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

INFLATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, inflation—the unwelcome marauder that gnaws away at buying power—is wreaking havoc in the family cupboard. While the general price index slowly but relentlessly moves upward, food prices are advancing at a rate that may bring severe dietary problems to households around the country.

The wholesale price index, in reaching a new high during July, presages still higher prices to come. Up from the 1959 average by 2.9 percent, that index is particularly dangerous because 2.5 percent of the total amount came during the past year. Despite reduction in excise taxes that took effect in July, the consumer price index continues upward.

The September 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal predicts that living costs will reach record levels this month and cites the especially sharp jump in food prices in recent years. Alarmed at this trend, the journal has undertaken to indicate substitute foods for those that have spiraled out of reach of the consumer's purse.

Mr. Speaker, unless the administration is willing to cut down unnecessary spending, inflation will endanger the living standard of every American family, particularly those on fixed incomes. A spendthrift government, dedicated to expansion of bureaucratic programs and oblivious to waste, triggers economic inflation. The resultant decline in buying power deprives a substantial part of our population of the necessities that include proper nourishment for the children who will make up the America of tomorrow.

If my colleagues have not recently visited a food market, I would suggest that a tour of the aisles can be a most enlightening venture. Check, if you will, the price of the most widely used meat cuts, which have jumped an average of 8 cents per pound—or 11 percent—in the past 4 months. And for those families who have looked to this season of the year to make up for the fruits that carried prohibitory price tags in past months, costs are appalling.

There are, of course, other factors that tend to drive prices upward and to preclude traditional seasonal bargains, but inflation remains the principal villain and looms more perilous in the months and years ahead. In reporting that Federal spending is heading for new peacetime peaks, William F. Arbogast, Associated Press staff writer, pointed out this often-overlooked but obviously inevitable conclusion in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of September 6:

Only the down payment for much of the cost of the nonmilitary program will be footed this year, for many of its facets are spread over future years.

The die that reduces in value the wages of our workers has been cast in the offices of Government extravagance, but Congress can yet stem the tide of predatory inflation by rejecting further unnecessary authorizations and appropriations, and by insisting upon a thorough accounting of all expenditures on the part of the executive departments. In behalf of all wage earners, but particularly those on fixed incomes, Congress has a responsibility to make every effort to require that the Federal Government adopt reasonable fiscal policies. To the pensioner, the widow whose monthly income cannot be adjusted upward, and to recipients of social security benefits, there is no other way out.

U.S. SUGAR INTERESTS SHOULD PLAY FAIR ON IMPORT FEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the two amendments which the Rules Committee has made in order to the Sugar Act would impose an import fee on sugar coming from foreign producers. Some doubt exists as to whether an import fee is regarded favorably by U.S. sugar interests.

Some doubt exists as to the attitude of the major elements of the U.S. sugar industry in regard to the import fee proposal. I have had several Members tell me they have received reports that I am misrepresenting the attitude of the U.S. sugar industry in regard to an import fee.

In order to help erase any doubt, I am placing in the RECORD the full text of recommendations the U.S. industry made, at the request of the Johnson administration and certain Members of Congress, on March 29, 1965, in regard to sugar legislation.

You will see that one of the recommendations made at that time to the administration and the Congress by the U.S. sugar industry was an import fee. To be sure, it was not exactly the same as the one which the Rules Committee, at my suggestion, has now made in order. However, I got the language for my import-fee amendment almost verbatim from the text of proposed language the U.S. industry submitted along

with its summary announcement. The only changes I made in the language on the import fee related to the amount of the fee—my version specifies 75 percent, whereas the industry recommended 50 percent or 1 cent a pound, whichever is lower—and a minor amendment on when the fee determination for the first year would be made.

The import-fee language proposed by the U.S. industry appeared on pages 17 and 18 of the mimeographed bill text. Here is the verbatim announcement issued for release March 29, 1965, by the U.S. sugar industry:

RELEASE BY DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR INDUSTRY, MAINLAND CANE SUGAR INDUSTRY, HAWAIIAN SUGAR INDUSTRY, PUERTO RICAN SUGAR INDUSTRY, AND THE U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSOCIATION

All segments of the U.S. sugar producing and refining industry—beet and cane—have joined in support of recommendations on sugar legislation for the consideration of Congress and the administration during the present session.

The industrywide recommendations were developed after several weeks of discussions and conferences undertaken at the specific request of Members of Congress and officials of the Johnson administration.

The recommendations, which are interrelated, are supported in their entirety by the domestic beet sugar industry, the mainland cane sugar industry, the Hawaiian sugar industry, the Puerto Rican sugar industry, and the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association.

During the last few days, terms of the industry recommendations have been discussed with Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee and other Members of Congress, with key officials of the Departments of Agriculture and State, and with members of the White House staff.

Industry spokesmen said the recommendations are designed to revise the Sugar Act so as to strengthen the assurance to U.S. consumers of adequate sugar supplies at all times and at stable, reasonable prices.

The proposal would also permit the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar producers to market, with the least possible reduction of foreign imports, the domestic production that is in excess of the present marketing quotas for those two areas.

Certain incentives are provided for foreign producers to meet their obligations to the U.S. market while at the same time adding to the fiscal soundness of the U.S. sugar program.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations would extend the act for a period of 5 years beyond its present expiration date of December 31, 1966, to the end of 1971.

When the annual consumption level is between 9,700,000 and 10,400,000 tons, the domestic beet sugar quota would be 3,025,000 tons and the mainland cane quota would be 1,100,000 tons. When consumption requirements are more than 10,400,000 tons, the quotas for the two areas would be increased proportionately, as provided in the present law. If consumption requirements are less than 9,700,000 tons, the quotas would be reduced proportionately. No other changes in domestic quotas are proposed.

It is estimated that by the end of the proposed extension period, the domestic beet and mainland cane quotas would be at approximately the levels they would have reached by that date under the present Sugar Act.

Foreign quotas for 1965, as already established by the Department of Agriculture, would be approximately the same. An import fee on foreign sugar, not effective this

year, would be reinstated next year, but limited to a maximum of 1 cent per pound or one-half the difference between the U.S. price objective and the world raw sugar price—whichever is less.

The fee to be established should have regard for (1) assuring foreign countries a fair return; and (2) insuring that foreign sugar will be available to the U.S. market in the quantities needed at the times required.

Reinstatement of an import fee, it is believed, would also tend to discourage over-expansion of the world sugar production and tend to facilitate achievement of price objectives of the act.

The "global quota" arrangement of the present law would be eliminated. The quota of any country with which the United States severs diplomatic relations would continue to be suspended, but would be allocated promptly to specific countries on a temporary basis.

Because present sugarbeet growers will necessarily have to reduce acreage further as a part of the proposed new program, national acreage reserve provisions contained in the 1962 act, under which new production areas were brought in, would not be extended after 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. sugar industry of course is entitled to change its mind and perhaps has done so on the question of the import fee, but it should be fair-minded in contacting Members of Congress and explain to them that the industry position has changed and why.

It may also be that the U.S. industry was not fully united in its position March 29 of this year on the import fee, and I daresay it is not united right now.

In evaluating the attitude of various interested parties, one should keep in mind the possibility that some U.S. sugar interests may also be heavily involved in foreign sugar, and vice versa.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Is not that fee the same as that which prevailed in prior sugar legislation?

Mr. FINDLEY. It is very similar to the import fee which was assessed against the Dominican Republic during the Eisenhower administration and was in effect in the legislation which operated in 1962, 1963, and 1964.

INSTRUCTOR IN HISTORY WELCOMES VIETCONG VICTORY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read on the wire that an instructor in history at Drew University, James Mellen, has declared himself as welcoming a Vietcong victory in Vietnam.

This despite over a hundred thousand American soldiers fighting to prevent such a victory. This despite American and Vietnamese being killed to prevent such a victory. It is just quite possible that this self-proclaimed Marxist is trying to attract a little attention to himself. I am sure the Republic will survive.

It has survived the early "Mellenheaded" thinking of Benedict Arnold who wished a victory for the other side when this country was engaged in another war.

Having once served on the faculty at Rutgers University I believe completely in academic freedom, even the free and full expression of fools in and out of academic circles and, therefore, I recognize Mr. Mellen's right to full expression. And I have a right to find his view appalling and disgraceful as well as unenlightened. He obviously does not know what a Vietcong victory entails.

When I was in Vietnam I saw what a Vietcong victory meant in some villages. It meant the mayor's head on a fence post. It meant hands chopped off. It meant young men dragged off for training against their will. It meant the stealing of all village food and medical supplies in the name of liberation. It meant the displacement of hope with fear. All because the South Vietnamese find it objectionable that they surrender their freedom to something called the liberation front, alias the Vietcong, alias the Communist army of North Vietnam.

Mr. Mellen, in proclaiming himself a Marxist, would indicate that while he is an instructor of history, he has not learned well the lessons of history. Even the Russian leaders admit that pure Marxism is unworkable. And everyone knows that history has never disclosed one country that has chosen communism in a free election.

It is common knowledge that the Vietcong are having some difficulty with their recruiting drive. Since Mr. Mellen has such strong convictions about welcoming a Vietcong victory, perhaps he should be given the opportunity to fight with the Vietcong and thus translate his words into a more meaningful note. I would be very happy to intercede in his behalf in making the necessary arrangements. Perhaps we could trade him for some of the American prisoners of war before they are murdered in cold blood by the Vietcong as were the two Americans last week.

In fact, some of our protesting students calling for a Vietcong victory could be included in such a trade and thus the Vietcong would have new recruits and we would save the lives of courageous Americans who are fighting to save the freedom Mr. Mellen and his ilk would have us abandon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly advise us as to the program for tomorrow and of any other information he cares to state.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the program previously announced we will have up tomorrow the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill. This is, of course, a very important matter. Members might expect a vote on that conference report.

In addition, we will take up, as previously announced, House Joint Resolution 642, which is the James Madison Memorial Library; H.R. 3142, the Medical Library Assistance Act; and H.R. 6519, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Act.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD VETO THE NEW IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported reform of our outdated immigration law and abolition of the infamous national origin system. When the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 was before the House in August, I voted for it and against all crippling amendments. One of the crippling amendments that I, along with the leadership, opposed then was a proposal to place a quota on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The House wisely rejected this proposal. But the Senate version of the bill contained an almost identical provision, establishing a quota of 120,000 persons a year on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This was one of the most important differences between the two bills. In my opinion, it was the most important difference. The bills went to conference and, as we all know, the conference report recommended adoption of the Senate provision. I offered a motion to recommit the report back to the conference with instruction to reject the Senate amendment establishing a quota for the Western Hemisphere. After my motion failed I voted against adoption of the conference report. I could not in good conscience vote for a so-called reform measure which merely transfers a bad practice from one part of the world to another.

We who have justly criticized the Iron Curtain, Bamboo Curtain, and the Berlin wall have reason to ponder about what we have done to our own hemisphere today. We have, in my judgment,

lowered a paper curtain and raised a wall of red tape around our borders. What is worse, these devices are aimed against the peoples of this hemisphere with whom we claim to be partners, neighbors, and even brothers.

The Western Hemisphere quota is ill-advised and unnecessary. Secretary Rusk expressed his strong opposition to it when he said that the amendment would, in effect, place obstacles in the path leading to cordial and harmonious relations with Latin America. It is no secret, for example, that under the language of the amendment, any one country such as Canada could entirely preempt the quota for any year by sending into the United States 120,000 immigrants. Who is to say that the persons administering the new law would not permit this? And what would be the effects on the Latin nations?

It is an unnecessary provision because under the present law immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere over the past 10 years has averaged only 110,000. With this new law we are thus creating a problem where there has been no problem in the past.

The favored treatment of the nations of this hemisphere whereby no quota is placed on immigration was granted in the act of 1924 for reasons which are still valid today. Our feelings of hemispheric solidarity go back to the Monroe Doctrine. Our faith in the good neighbor policy and pan-American friendship was reaffirmed with the Alliance for Progress. The quota on immigration from the Western Hemisphere approved by the House today is shattering to this faith.

I am therefore asking President Johnson to veto the Immigration and Nationality Act. The pledges we have made to all the peoples of the Americas of friendship and brotherhood must be upheld, or like bad checks, they will come back one day to haunt us.

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY OF UCCA

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are numerous dedicated groups in the country effectively representing their unique membership and maintaining a legitimate interest in subject matter within their jurisdiction. An organization which fits the description I have just given is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Its president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, is a noted economist and authority on the Soviet Union.

Dr. Dobriansky produced a very timely article for the Ukrainian Quarterly's Autumn 1965 edition which I insert in

the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, Autumn, 1965]

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY OF UCCA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past 15 years many changes have taken place in every part of this world. The changes have been of every conceivable character—economic, technological, political, social, religious, cultural, and so forth. Any organization that has attracted international as well as domestic interest would necessarily have to take account of such changes if this rich interest is to be intensified and broadened. The policy position of the organization must be periodically interpreted in terms of the changed conditions, its programs must be prudently adapted to the new circumstances, and its publications and literary contributions must reflect a steady awareness of the currents and cross-currents abroad in the world.

Significantly, as shifting conditions have warranted it, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has at intervals defined and elaborated in the simplest and most precise terms possible the nature and objectives of its general policy. It has forthrightly stated and restated its position to innumerable inquirers who have raised the usual questions: "What are you for and against?", "Are you supported by foreign sources?", "Are you an emigré organization?", and "What are your purposes and aims?" Some, like the Washington Post in 1963, have mischaracterized the organization as one of the most powerful lobbies on Capitol Hill; others, like our recent Presidents, have properly viewed it as a citizens group contributing to the welfare of this Nation; while still others, like the organs of colonialist Moscow and puppet Kiev, have furnished a series of hallucinations about the organization. The answers and replies have always been, so to speak, on open record and in the books, even for those with short memories or those suffering pains of uncertainty or changed allegiance.

As far back as 1951, for example, the committee offered its concrete responses to the problems that were then pressing and outstanding.¹ Taking full cognizance of numerous developments at home and in the world, it again stated its policy clearly and distinctly 6 years later.² In March 1965, UCCA expressed itself once more as to the nature and structure of its policy in the light of changes over the past 8 years. As in the preceding years, this action was necessary because of the never-ending inquiries, the forgetfulness of some, the healthiness of a periodic reexamination, and the doubts of a few who have been misguided by superficial developments in the Red empire and elsewhere.

The remarkable aspect of all these policy statements is the basic continuity of what are essentially principles and guidelines to a completely educational policy of UCCA. The 1957 statement, for instance, did not waver in this fundamental respect from the previous one, despite notable changes in the world such as the death of Stalin, the Pereyaslav Treaty concessions, the abortive Hungarian revolution, the sputnik, and a host of other developments. Some individuals read too much into several of these changes and went hopelessly astray. As is often the case, changes in degree are mistaken for changes in kind, transformed appearances are misinterpreted for substantive modifications. In addition, mistakes of this sort usually reveal

frail convictions, not to say tenuous knowledge.

Since 1957 to the very present who can deny the sweeping changes that have marked contemporary history? The tremendous economic strides of the United States, Western Europe, and other parts of the free world, the space explorations of this period, captive Cuba, the weakening of NATO, the Sino-Soviet Russian rift, the economic troubles of the Red Empire, Sino-Russian infiltration of Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia, Vietnam and numerous other significant developments can be cited. Each of these has to be rationally considered when one speaks of a policy that is fixed in principle but not static in content, flexible for operation but not naive in pragmatism, founded on certitude but not sterile in action. Each of these changes and more were carefully taken account of as the 1965 educational policy of UCCA was developed and accepted by its executive bodies. As in every instance, the policy can be democratically revised at the UCCA conventions, but in view of the firm and tested continuity of this policy, the likelihood of any substantial revision is virtually nil.

TEN POLICY POINTS

The educational policy of UCCA rests on 10 fundamental points. These really constitute the principles and guidelines of UCCA action. Dealing with norms, purposes, objectives, and principles, the 10 points naturally cannot provide ready answers to all problem situations. To expect this is to demand omniscience. The vain and actually absurd pretention of omniscience can best be left with the Red totalitarians. However, in the necessary interplay of theory and practice, idea and act, these points do provide a base for a rational treatment of pertinent problems, regardless of how complex they may be. The recurring plan of complexity is no excuse for inaction or muddled performance.

I. PRIMARY CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF UNITED STATES

Preceding all others, the first cardinal point of UCCA's educational policy is work and effort aimed at preserving and strengthening the national security of the United States. This has been and is the most fundamental objective of UCCA, and its accomplishment is being progressively realized through the many unique channels open to it. In one of his messages to a UCCA convention President Harry S. Truman underscored this point and stated that "The natural desire of all peoples for a free way of life will be strengthened as the true story of democracy is made known in lands where distortion has become an art of government."³ This includes the United States as well as Ukraine and all the captive nations. It includes Russia. The statement alludes to only one of the functions of UCCA.

We cannot repeat too often the famous declaration of our late President John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." For us, this epitomized the spirit and action of UCCA long before it was uttered and appeared in print. If any group has hammered away at the truth that without a strong and courageous America, to which every citizen must contribute, the cause of freedom would be lost throughout the world, it is certainly this national organization. Freedom for Ukraine and for all the captive nations would be truly a grand illusion. Dedicated to our American traditions of democracy and independence, as expressed by

the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution, UCCA is a completely American institution, a national organization, that draws upon a wealth of Ukrainian resourcefulness and experience to do what it can for our country and thus, in the world context, for the eventual liberation and freedom of all the captive nations, including the largest of them in Eastern Europe, Ukraine itself.

Contrary to illusions held by some, UCCA is not, nor has ever been, an ersatz Ukrainian parliament, a government-in-exile, or an agent for any government-in-exile. Where these fanciful notions have arisen, it is difficult to say. However, various reasons inspiring and promoting such notions are not difficult to surmise. Any attempt to compromise the character of this essentially educational institution—which is one of Americans of Ukrainian background infused with a free Kozak spirit—and to hamper its effectiveness would tactically utilize such distortions. The plain fact is that not an iota of evidence exists to prove that UCCA is other than what it has been from its very inception.

It would literally take dozens of volumes to record the public testimonies, releases, articles, statements, and other documents, not to include a series of books and brochures, that have been produced and issued by UCCA in the specific interrelated interests of our Nation, the entire free world, and the captive nations in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The educational purpose and value of UCCA's functions, indeed its very being, have been amply confirmed by the countless messages of support and complimentary affirmation received over the years from virtually every sphere of our American society.

From this strictly educational viewpoint, two notable and historic contributions by UCCA deserve mention. The first is the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90) passed by Congress in 1959. UCCA was in the educational vanguard for the passage of this resolution, which was authored by its president and explained by its branches throughout the States. Year in and year out, with every passing Captive Nations Week, Moscow and its junior partner and their colonial puppets pour verbal venom on the resolution. There is a morbid fear on their part that the resolution will in time be fully implemented; there is nothing but boundless psychopolitical power in this widespread fear for us.

The second, solid contribution to American understanding of the Soviet Russian menace is the Shevchenko Statue of Liberty in Washington. The Shevchenko Memorial Resolution (Public Law 86-749) was also the result of the educational efforts of UCCA, its president formulating its contents and its membership propagating its meaning and significance among fellow Americans. As the roster of the honorary committee for the Shevchenko unveiling showed, the response across the country was tremendous.

Less spectacular but equally solid contributions by UCCA have been registered in the areas of immigration, the investigation of Communist aggression, the Voice of America's broadcasts to the Soviet Union, the development of Radio Liberty, the institutionalization of Captive Nations Week, and official recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day. The organization's continuous work in combating myths and falsehoods about the Soviet Union and rendering positive information and knowledge about the Red Empire are even less dramatic, but for the long run are perhaps of more fundamental worth. In addition, as an intensely active citizens' group, representing with certainty the thoughts and sentiments of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian background, UCCA

¹ "The Political Policy of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 52-64.

² "UCCA Policy Today," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XIII, No. 4, pp. 297-304.

³ Message of the President of the United States, the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 15-August 1, 1952, p. 1.

is invariably consulted on matters of new legislation, new research projects, and public events. The Freedom Academy bill, the measure for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, the East-West trade issue, the Consular Treaty with the U.S.S.R. are only a few examples.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, who as Senator had participated in many Ukrainian independence observances, accurately portrayed our cause in a memorable message at the conclusion of the Shevchenko festivities. He said, "This is a cause which has not yet been fully won as long as there are still bonds of servitude which keep men from enjoying their rights and their liberties anywhere in the world."⁴ "Anywhere in the world" means Ukraine and the other captive nations in the U.S.S.R.

II. THE DECISIVE DEFEAT OF SOVIET RUSSIAN IMPERIOCOLONIALISM

Concerning the most recent developments, UCCA was spontaneous in its support of President Johnson's courageous action in Vietnam. This unstinted support could almost be deduced from the points described here and the principles by which we abide and live. Our knowledge and convictions caused us to go even further, urging the President "to accommodate South Vietnamese psychopolitical warfare farther north, to North Vietnam, warning the captive people of that Communist satellite that their aggressive Communist masters will eventually meet their doom."⁵ It was no different in the case of the Dominican Republic which was on the skids of a classical Communist takeover. Our endorsement of the President's action was unanimous, praising the President for his "preventive diplomacy toward the Dominican nation, truly saving it from an insidious Communist takeover sponsored jointly by the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists, the Red Chinese totalitarians, and the Castro quislings."⁶

However, conflicts on the fringes of the Red Empire should not blind us to the fact that both historically and analytically the ultimate source of the global friction is Soviet Russia in the U.S.S.R. This and other dominant reasons justify the second paramount point in UCCA's educational policy, namely the goal of decisively defeating Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism without precipitating a world holocaust. We readily recognize the emergence of Red Chinese imperialism and the rivalries involved in the Sino-Soviet Russian rift. Yet, a wishful exaggeration of either or both cannot overshadow the blunt facts of predominant Soviet Russian power in the Red Empire. Sober analysis of comparative economic, military, and technological data can only lead to the logical conclusion that the whole Red Empire, including Mao's China, Tito's Yugoslavia and Castro's Cuba, in the final countdown depends on the strength and power of the U.S.S.R. On the basis of hard facts rather than fleeting political rhetoric about polycentrism and the demise of bipolarity, the U.S.S.R. stands in the same power relation to the rest of the Red Empire that the USA does in relation to the rest of the free world. If for some reason either should collapse, the rest would go, too.

In line with these perspectives, many current notions bearing on developments in the Red Empire are critically challenged by UCCA. As one example, the notion of "a growing independence of East European na-

tions" is a product of wishful thinking rather than a reflection of basic reality. At the beginning of this decade Moscow itself indicated the need for more flexible relations between Red states in order to enhance the strength of all. It was accommodated in this by the insert policy of the West toward the captive nations. In the area of Russian/non-Russian relations within the Soviet Union the evidence on flexible maneuvers to suit Moscow's purposes is overwhelming in its provision of precedents to what is occurring now in Central Europe.

UCCA has developed and advanced the valuable concept of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. In the past 15 years the concept has gained wide currency in official and private circles. It is anathema to Moscow because it emphasizes the primary enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and sterilizes persistent Russian propaganda charges of American imperialism, particularly among the underdeveloped states. The concept is an integral part of the broader captive nations conception which, too, is powerfully challenging to so-called Communist ideology.

In advancing these truths, UCCA does not minimize the deceptive power of Communist theory and ideology. On the contrary, it has always urged the necessity for a full exposure of the Russian and Chinese perversion of Marxism and the need to distinguish between the red clothes of Marxism-Leninism and the matadors of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism that are behind them. We have marched a long way in impressing these distinctions and truths on the minds of other freemen. And since much remains to be done, all like-minded friends of freedom should always remember the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, "my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statue of Taras Shevchenko will here enkindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men."⁷

III. DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF FREE WORLDWIDE CONTACTS

Constructive contributions to the free world's struggle for expanded freedom and against Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism can never be realized by sole possession of ideas, knowledge, talents, experience, and views. The steady and ever-widening circulation of such resources is imperative. This is almost stating the obvious. Yet to bring all this armament into operational play requires the formation of relations and contacts, time, and extensive travel.

UCCA has always emphasized the importance of developing and maintaining farflung free worldwide contacts. For maximum implementation of its educational programs and objectives this organization has developed lines of communication with groups and individuals on every continent. With its American orientation and Ukrainian background resources, it has contacts with scholarly, cultural, political, religious and other groups, both Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian, throughout the world. These necessary relations imply no integral connections, no subsidies given or received, no preferential treatment or subordination of institutional will. They are simply indispensable channels for rich exchanges of ideas, informational flows, and the development of mutual projects.

On the plane of religious relations the question of a Ukrainian Catholic patriarchate has been widely discussed. This really has posed no problem for UCCA. If you have read carefully the essential elaboration of point one, it should be evident that in its

dedication to the historic principles of the American tradition, UCCA by definition is given to complete religious freedom, here, in Ukraine or elsewhere. This patriarchate would be both an expression of religious freedom and a vital national symbol of Ukraine. Its concrete establishment rests entirely with the decision of the papacy, which is in the best position to determine when, how, where, and who. Entanglements of any intra-religious sort are clearly beyond the purview of UCCA.

IV. ACTION COORDINATION WITH OTHER NATIONAL U.S. ORGANIZATIONS

In one of his messages to UCCA our late President Kennedy made a very significant point. He declared, "It would be surprising and also contrary to American traditions if our citizens of Ukrainian descent failed to retain interest in their former homeland or to show concern for the fate and future of Ukrainians there."⁸ What the 35th President of the United States was stressing is the ever-present need of American understanding of other peoples and nations. With regard to Ukraine, who could better transmit such understanding than those who were born and lived there, as well as those who were born here but raised in such understanding?

To easily convey an accurate knowledge and appreciative understanding of Ukraine, as well as of other neighboring nations in Eastern Europe, a close action coordination with other national American organizations is a *sine qua non*. UCCA has long recognized this fact, so that today it itself is a member of several organizations, such as the All-American Conference To Combat Communism or the National Captive Nations Committee, and has coordinated its educational policy with the work of many groups dealing with a variety of subjects. Soviet Russian and Red Chinese genocide, cold war education, U.S. foreign policy, the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., and many other subjects have brought UCCA into a common bond with numerous groups and organizations.

Captive Nations Week, held annually in July, has provided an excellent medium for coordinated effort among our citizen groups. Veteran, youth, women's and other organizations now participate in the week's observance and the base of coordination steadily expands. UCCA performs its educational task for the benefit of others, who in this productive exchange does the same for us.

V. AVOIDANCE OF MYOPIC INVOLVEMENTS IN TERRITORIAL PROBLEMS

Another important principle in UCCA's policy is the scrupulous avoidance of myopic involvements in territorial problems, whether in Europe or Asia. This is not to say that an occasional discussion of such problems should not be undertaken. It would be unrealistic not to do so. But to become so involved as to delineate boundary lines for the future, as between Ukraine and Russia, Poland, and Lithuania etc., is a fruitless expenditure of time and energy. It is also a potential source of needless friction.

The first and foremost objective is to lay the educational groundwork for the freedom of all the captive nations. This goal of freedom is primary; the matter of boundaries is secondary and even of no consequence at this time. Paradoxically, a general recognition of this basic fact makes it possible to discuss territorial and boundary issues in a calmer and more friendly atmosphere. And, as in the case of the Oder-Neisse line, it can in time contribute to an acceptable solution

⁴ The President's Shevchenko message, the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 1-15, 1965, p. 63.

⁵ "UCCA Endorses President Johnson's Policies in Vietnam," the Ukrainian Bulletin, Apr. 1-15, 1965, p. 29.

⁶ "UCCA Fully Supports President Johnson's Preventive Action in Santo Domingo," the Ukrainian Bulletin, issued June 1-15, 1965, p. 49.

⁷ Shevchenko address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Ukrainian Bulletin, June-August 1964, p. 43.

⁸ Presidential message, the Ukrainian Bulletin, November-December 1962, p. 82.

without hindering the freedom efforts of both the Poles and Germans.

VI. THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLD WAR EDUCATION

Almost 20 years ago an outstanding American writer and political analyst observed that "No people in Europe have a better fighting anti-Communist record than the Ukrainian."⁹ The observation pointed to a wealth of experience in various types of warfare against the Soviet Russians—political, propaganda, and guerrilla. Anyone in the least familiar with the history of Ukraine from the Soviet Russian conquest in 1920 to the present can cite at will episodes and events substantiating this overall judgment. This fund of experience, learned directly and vicariously, lies at the base of UCCA's advocacy and advancement of cold war education in America.

The Red totalitarians have trained their professional revolutionaries for decades. Their schools have developed the operational science of political warfare, encompassing a whole range of subjects and techniques for conquest and takeover. There is nothing comparable to this in the free world. As a consequence, UCCA has long supported the establishment of a U.S. Freedom Academy and the idea of a supplementing private academy to train leaders in the theory and operations of psychopolitical warfare. Cuba, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic are recent examples of Red political warfare; there will be more to come. This special type of warfare is the Red empire's chief hope for further expansion, barring any startling breakthrough in military-space ventures.

It has been for these reasons and more that UCCA has persistently opposed the policy of simple containment, which today is really a quilt of patched up containment. Only an intelligently understood policy of liberation, based on the operational science and art of psychopolitical warfare, can fend off further Red aggression in the free world, offer the best insurance against a hot global war, and pave the way for cold war victory.

As any Christian-motivated organization must do, UCCA has always upheld the principle of genuine, peaceful coexistence between and among nations. The Russian perversion of this principle, which it uses as a shield for its cold war activities, should be clearly understood. Moreover, the notion of evolution as applied to the U.S.S.R. and other Red states, whereby they will be transformed into peaceable and respectable entities, is belied by facts on their economic priorities, Communist Party controls, and global cold war operations. If evolution is to play a role, it would have to be selective under a liberation policy and not random as under present conditions.

Finally, the educational policy of UCCA has consistently supported the principle of unrestricted cultural exchange. This is a natural corollary of peaceful coexistence which would be reinforced by a healthy interpenetration of ideas and customs. The present brand of highly restricted cultural exchange is an instrument of cold war calculation for Moscow, resulting in numerous net advantages for our adversary.

Subtle Red attempts to neutralize and weaken anti-Communist organizations here should be firmly resisted. Red gestures to participate in the Shevchenko statue unveiling, to display the Ukrainian front to Moscow, the United Nations, and in the U.S.S.R. embassy in Washington, and to promote cultural meetings with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry are only a few examples that have been properly thwarted by UCCA. One would have to be naive, indeed, to believe that dispatched Ukrainian agents of

the Red Empire are motivated by purely cultural reasons. UCCA policy discourages the provision of any forums for these agents and any contacts with them by its leadership and membership. Nothing can be gained from them, much can be lost as the inevitable distortions of such meetings are circulated in Ukraine. UCCA policy is oriented toward the captive people of Ukraine, and they in greatest percentage are not permitted to travel.

VII. REJECTION OF COMMON GUILT OF UNVESTED RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Another cardinal principle of UCCA's educational policy is the outright rejection of any common guilt on the part of the unvested and oppressed Russian people for the crimes and aggressions of the government in Moscow. To be strongly and rightly opposed to Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism does not mean to be against the Russian people. Any attempt to confuse the two is sufficient cause for suspicion. The vast majority of the Russian people cannot be confused with the exploiting new class and the 12 million Communist Party members, their families and relatives who have a stake in Soviet Russian totalitarian rule and imperial dominion.

The unvested Russian people are a captive people, though not in the full sense of captivity as the non-Russian peoples. Russia was not overrun and conquered by any foreign aggressor. By and large the Russian nation has been captive for over five centuries in the closed society of barbaric Russian political institutions. The real independence of Russia means the final liberation of its people from this institutional bondage and its nexus, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. One of the greatest contributions to the independence of Russia and the liberation of its people would be the defeat of this imperio-colonialism. This is why it is so important to concentrate on this central force.

VIII. THE NECESSARY DISMEMBERMENT OF THE SOVIET RUSSIAN EMPIRE

Logically consistent with the preceding point is this one establishing the goal of the necessary dismemberment of the Soviet Russian Empire. Another way of putting it is the goal of freedom and independence for all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. The twin forces of Russian imperio-colonialism and totalitarianism are the main props of the empire. A weakening of the former would undermine the latter, and pave the way for the independence of both the non-Russian nations and Russia. This is the meaning of a necessary dismemberment of the empire.

No reputable source has ever advocated the dismemberment of Russia, the nation itself. To bring about the dismemberment of the entire empire or its primary structure, the Soviet Union, does not mean the cutting up of Russia. For the last is not identical with either of the preceding two. Here, too, any attempt to identify the dismemberment of the U.S.S.R. with that of Russia is the result of either an empire bias or an incapacity to distinguish realities. When we note a so-called expert on Russia writing about the Russian Empire as a "traditional Russian state" and claiming that the "breakup" of this empire would mean "the dismemberment of Russia," we have good cause to wonder about the sources of his authority.¹⁰

There are many others on the American scene who are similarly confused. This unfortunate condition emphasizes again the importance of UCCA's educational policy in these times. No one profits from this protracted confusion but the totalitarian Red

adversaries of America. From a window in the Kremlin this confused state of mind is political capital for Russian cold war gaming.

IX. INTENSIFYING THE PERENNIAL FORCE OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

Since its inception UCCA has produced a variety of works dealing with the principle of national self-determination. This historic principle is a precious one in the revolutionary American tradition. Untiringly, UCCA has shown how the Russian Bolsheviks under Lenin had perverted and exploited it in creating the new Soviet Russian Empire and how the present imperio-colonialists in Moscow are manipulating it in the underdeveloped and formerly colonial areas. The importance of fully exposing Soviet Russian and Red Chinese imperio-colonialism in the United Nations and throughout the world cannot be too strongly emphasized.

These and other reasons account for UCCA's educational goal of intensifying the perennial force of national self-determination in its genuine and true sense. This force is truly a nuclear spiritual device that has not been properly employed by us in the United Nations, over the Voice of America, and through numerous other media. Moreover, the delicate use of the principle still eludes the understanding of many. For example, historically the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and other parts of Moscow's empire have already determined themselves. Thus, in present circumstances, the application of this basic principle can only mean a revived opportunity to exercise fully and freely, without foreign domination or restraint, the already determined wills of these various captive nations.

X. GRADUAL FEDERATION OF EUROPE AND OF ASIA

Lastly, the final point of UCCA's educational policy is the gradual federation of Europe and of Asia. With a working vision of the future, it has consistently held that this historic process cannot logically begin in Eastern Europe without the moral and political base of genuine national independence and freedom. Both in Western and Eastern Europe the necessities of economic and technologic integration have been at work for some time, but the real fruition of the federalizing process depends on politico-moral criteria, and very likely would pass through stages of confederation.

Independence—confederation—federation would be the necessary process in Eastern Europe, Asia, and even now noncaptive Africa. The formula satisfies the driving necessities of history and could create a framework preserving the national identities, treasures, and diversities of each people. It certifies to a future of freedom, growth, and prosperity as against the mythical Red wave of the future featured by tyranny, imperio-colonialist exploitation, and cultural darkness.

CONCLUSION

Fifteen years ago this national organization dedicated its resources to a lifetime project—"Our Crusade of Truth for Freedom."¹¹ It has been and is a crusade in an educational sense. Time is short, and it takes time to learn the truth. As one scans the range of UCCA's fundamental educational activities over these years, he cannot but conclude that this dedicated effort of all involved has succeeded well and also has an even brighter future than ever before: publications, work with congressional committees, international representations, endless consultations, public observances, testimonies, promotion of citizens' participation in election campaigns, use of communications media, and humanitarian and cultural projects.

⁹ William Henry Chamberlin, "Ukraine: Ally Behind the Iron Curtain, the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. IV, No. 1, 1948, pp. 10-18.

¹⁰ George F. Kennan, "On Dealing With the Communist World" (New York, 1964), pp. 13-14.

¹¹ The Ukrainian Bulletin, vol. III, No. 20, Oct. 15, 1950, pp. 1, 4.

The 10 points of UCCA's educational policy are the foundation of this crusade of truth for freedom. The crusade is not one of fanatical emotion but of calm convictions; it is not one of imposed views but the opportunity for reasoned deliberation; it is, in essence, an organized effort in education for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in devoting the majority of my time this afternoon to the reading of Dr. Dobriansky's article is my belief that it warrants very careful scrutiny by all those interested in the virtues of the policies of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

At a time when Communist propaganda and Communist infiltrators are using every device to penetrate our news media and brainwash the American public, a clearcut, logical and wholesome program such as the policies advocated by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America are an affirmative free world answer to the Communist propaganda smokescreen.

Mr. Speaker, the problems that face us around the world must be logically and precisely analyzed, and this report from the Ukrainian Quarterly to which I have referred serves that purpose.

HOW ABOUT THE NON-NEGRO POOR?—AN UNTOLD STORY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if ever anyone is interested in determining how effective the war on poverty will be they should first read the article in the October 4, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "How About the Non-Negro Poor?—An Untold Story" and then read their report on the history of a once proud race—the Indian people of America.

The article points out, as I have tried to point out time after time in this body, that the Federal Government is spending untold millions of dollars, supposedly in an effort to assist the Indian people in their fight to adopt the non-Indian's civilization, but that conditions today on most Indian reservations are worse than they were 25 or 30 years ago.

U.S. News & World Report also shows:

In the last 15 years, more than \$2 billion has been spent by the Government to help Indians. This exceeds the total spent for that purpose in the preceding 150 years. Yet, by and large, Indians remain desperately poor. Along with the problems of poverty, they sometimes find themselves discriminated against by whites in some parts of the West. But no demonstrations are organized for Indian rights.

It is now 15 years since I came to Congress and during that time I have fought a running battle for the benefit of the Indian people—not a battle to raid the Federal Treasury—not a battle begging for cash—but a battle to give the Indian

people a chance—a chance to learn, to work, to learn to save, and to learn to get ahead. But every effort I have made has been blocked by bureaucratic red-tape and a philosophy of many in the Department that the Indian people should be retained as a museum piece.

There is only one way to solve the problem of poverty among the Indians and that is jobs. There is only one way to bring jobs onto the reservation and that is through some kind of an incentive and the only incentive that will move industry is a tax incentive. But those in high places in the Department of Interior oppose an incentive program. They want to solve the Indian problem through the poverty program. They want to build roads, public buildings, and the like, on these reservations, where the Federal Government can control the funds, can control who works, and pretty much have control over how the Indian spends the money he earns.

At the present rate, 100 years from now the Indians will be a hundred times worse off than they are today, even after the Federal Government has wasted more billions in making them destitute, rather than making them citizens.

I have asked consent to insert a portion of the U.S. News & World Report article in the RECORD, which is as follows:

Without question, the American Indians are the most poverty-stricken ethnic group found in the United States.

Surviving now are about 550,000 Indians. Of these, an estimated 380,000 live on or near reservations, with a median family income of \$1,500—less than half the median family income for Negroes, and about one-fourth the median figure for all U.S. families.

Unemployment on most reservations runs 40 to 50 percent. Indians lack the education and skills needed to compete for jobs. There are exceptions—such as the Indians of the Mohawk tribe, who earn high pay as structural-steel workers. But the exceptions are few.

Nine out of ten dwellings in which Indian families live on or adjacent to reservations—where summers usually are blistering hot, winters bleak and cold—are far below minimum standards for urban housing. They are hovels, shantytown-like hogans, tar-paper shacks.

Compared to non-Indian babies, the Indian child born on a reservation has only one-half the chance of reaching his first birthday. Life expectancy for reservation-dwelling Indians is two-thirds of the U.S. average.

Indians are not wards of the Government. They are American citizens, free to work and live where they please. But efforts by the Government to integrate Indians by encouraging them to move to cities have not been very successful.

Of the estimated 170,000 who have left the reservations to take jobs in cities and towns, not many have prospered. Most live in slums. About one-third of the Indians who have been persuaded to relocate in cities wind up back on a reservation.

BANKING COMMITTEE REVOLTS ON BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee signed a petition demanding that the chairman of the committee call a meeting to consider the bank merger bill. Those of us who signed the petition feel that immediate consideration should be given to this legislation and that it should not be allowed to drag on and on and on.

Mr. Arlen J. Large wrote a most informative article in the Wall Street Journal of September 30 pointing out the salient facts in the history of the bank merger bill. Believing his comments would be of particular interest to my colleagues in the House, under unanimous consent I insert the article, "Bank Merger Legislation May Be Speeded by House Unit Revolt, Katzenbach Retreat" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 30, 1965]

BANK-MERGER LEGISLATION MAY BE SPEEDED BY HOUSE UNIT REVOLT, KATZENBACH RETREAT

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—A House Banking Committee revolt against its chairman and an apparent retreat by Attorney General Katzenbach may finally break the bitter congressional deadlock over bank-merger legislation.

Yesterday, 19 members of the 33-member Banking Committee filed a formal petition demanding that Chairman PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, call a meeting to consider at least 4 different versions of a bank-merger bill. With Congress likely to adjourn next month, Mr. PATMAN has been accused of stalling action by refusing to end hearings on a Senate-passed version. Under a rarely invoked House rule, the committee majority's action will compel Mr. PATMAN to call a meeting within 10 days.

When the panel convenes, it will consider a surprise new Johnson administration proposal for compromising a dispute over the guidelines by which a proposed bank merger is approved or rejected. After quarreling among themselves for weeks, key administration officials have agreed to endorse a provision strongly desired by the banking industry and fiercely opposed by Mr. PATMAN. The administration position was disclosed in a secret letter to Representative PATMAN by Mr. Katzenbach, who had previously testified vigorously against the Senate bill.

The provision endorsed by Mr. Katzenbach: If a bank merger is challenged in court under the antitrust laws, judges must consider not only the merger's effect on competition but its possible offsetting desirability on other grounds. These include benefits to the community, the financial condition of the merging banks, vigor of their management, and other factors.

The administration's agreement to accept this point is important. Under a 1960 law, Congress instructed Federal bank regulatory agencies to consider six of these other factors in addition to competition in judging a bank merger. In 1963, however, the Justice Department accused two merging Philadelphia banks of violating the antitrust laws even though the merger had been approved by a bank regulatory agency under the 1960 guidelines. The Supreme Court agreed that the merger violated the antitrust laws and the Justices ruled it illegal.

ENDORSED BY OFFICIALS

This conflict between the 1960 bank merger law and the antitrust laws gave rise to the

current congressional fight. Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, and Senator PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, pushed through the Senate earlier this year a bill giving the Justice Department only 30 days to challenge a merger in the courts on antitrust grounds after the merger had been approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. A merger challenged by the Justice Department during this 30-day period would be suspended until the Court decided whether the consolidation violated terms of the Sherman or Clayton Antitrust Acts. If the Justice Department failed to move within the 30-day period, the merger would be considered final. In addition, the Robertson-Proxmire bill would cancel antitrust proceedings against six mergers already challenged by the Justice Department; courts have already ruled two of these violated the antitrust laws.

At Chairman PATMAN's marathon hearings before his 12-man House Banking Subcommittee, the Senate bill was endorsed by Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Chairman K. A. Randall. Currency Comptroller James Saxon also said he favored the Senate bill, but he suggested the real solution would be to give the regulatory agencies and the courts the same guidelines in ruling on proposed mergers.

Attorney General Katzenbach, on August 18, was a star witness for Mr. PATMAN. He denounced the Senate bill in blistering terms and defended the Justice Department's right to challenge a bank merger on antitrust grounds alone.

This disagreement among administration officials has been resolved in part, with the decision obviously going in favor of Mr. Saxon and against Mr. Katzenbach. In last Friday's letter to Representative PATMAN, Mr. Katzenbach said the enforcement of uniform merger guidelines for the agencies and courts is supported by Treasury Secretary Fowler, Comptroller Saxon, and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Chairman Randall.

In his letter, Mr. Katzenbach sought to minimize the conflict that the banking industry thinks exists between the 1960 merger law and the antitrust laws.

DIFFERENCES OVERSTATED

"While there are those in the banking industry and, indeed, in government who differ with me," Mr. Katzenbach wrote, "I strongly believe that objective analysis will disclose that in actual practice the differences in the standards applied by the banking agencies and by the courts, if any, have been overstated." Nevertheless, the Attorney General added, he agrees "the appearance of conflicting standards is undesirable, particularly where it is seized upon by the industry and sincerely felt to be a substantial problem."

Mr. Katzenbach concluded: "In summary, I am not opposed to legislation which would clarify the application of antitrust law to banks and am sympathetic to provisions which would remove some of the fears presently held by the banking industry with respect to retroactive application of section 1 of the Sherman Act or section 7 of the Clayton Act."

"Nor would the (Justice) Department be opposed to explicitly providing that the factors taken into account by the banking agencies under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 would also be taken into account by the courts. . . . We believe all such factors should be taken into account in determining whether the merger is desired to be in the public interest. We believe it important to keep in mind that both regulation and competition have a role to play in seeing to it that banking institutions serve the high and especial public interest for which they are designed."

ALTERNATIVE BILL

Mr. Katzenbach said this view is in line with an alternative bill sponsored by Representative ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio. Nineteen members—a majority—of the full House Banking Committee support the Ashley proposal, which would allow the Justice Department to challenge in court an agency-approved merger but would require the judges to consider the same factors outlined by the 1960 law.

Mr. Katzenbach suggested a revision of one part of the Ashley bill that some bankers fear would cause delay in the processing of merger applications. The Attorney General said he sees no reason for extensive agency hearings to lay legal groundwork for later court review of the agency's merger decision; he said he favors letting a regulatory agency follow existing practice in deciding whether to approve a merger. If the Justice Department wants to challenge this finding, it should start a new action in the courts, he said.

Mr. Katzenbach's letter seems to undercut another alternative plan being drafted by Representative WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, with the support of Chairman PATMAN and most of the other Democrats on the 12-member subcommittee handling the Senate bill. The Weltner proposal would take the opposite tack by requiring bank regulatory agencies to give primary importance to the competitive consequences of the proposed mergers; if the agency decided the merger would restrict competition, the merger couldn't be approved even if the six other factors seemed desirable. A merger that passed this test could still be challenged in the courts by the Justice Department on antitrust grounds within 60 days after agency approval of the merger.

Although Mr. Katzenbach said administration officials agree on the question of merger guidelines, he wrote Mr. PATMAN that there's still an argument over treatment of the six bank mergers that would be excused from antitrust prosecution by the Senate bill. Mr. Katzenbach said he still has "very strong objections" to forgiveness of the two mergers already held illegal by the courts.

"With respect to cases awaiting trial, . . . I feel they should be subjected by the courts to the same standards by which future mergers would be governed, if any new legislation should be enacted," the Attorney General said. This presumably means the Justice Department wants no reprieve for Manufacturers Trust Co. and Hanover Bank, both of New York, which merged in 1961 and were later found in a Federal district court to have violated the antitrust laws, or for First National Bank & Trust Co. and Security Trust Co., both of Lexington, Ky., whose 1961 merger was ruled illegal last year by the Supreme Court.

On the other hand, the Attorney General apparently wants the courts in the four pending cases to follow the proposed new guidelines contained in any bill that emerges from Congress. This would cover pending Justice Department actions against Continental-Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. and City National Bank & Trust Co., both of Chicago; the Crocker Anglo National Bank of San Francisco and the Citizens National Bank of Los Angeles; the Third National Bank and Nashville Bank & Trust Co., both of Nashville; and Mercantile Trust Co. National Association and Security Trust Co., both of St. Louis.

DIFFERENT APPROACH

This plan differs from a rough consensus already reached among many Banking Committee Democrats to use the Supreme Court's June 17, 1963, decision in the Philadelphia merger as the benchmark for excusing banks currently in antitrust trouble. The rival plans sponsored by Representatives ASHLEY and WELTNER would both excuse the three mergers consummated before the Supreme

Court decision, on the ground the banks didn't realize the antitrust laws might be applied to them. This would excuse the New York, Chicago and Lexington mergers, while leaving in the courts the California, Nashville, and St. Louis consolidations.

Even if the full Banking Committee can agree on a bill, there's no assurance that final legislation can be enacted before adjournment. The committee's product will probably differ from the Senate bill, requiring negotiations between the House and Senate banking lawmakers on a final version. If Congress adjourns by mid-October or so, time possibly would have run out and work on the bill would be resumed next January.

Banking Committee members who want some form of legislation enacted have been muttering for weeks about Chairman PATMAN's stalling tactics, but they were reluctant to take the unusual step of compelling him officially to call a meeting on the bill. The Katzenbach letter apparently was a factor in their decision to go ahead with the challenge. Yesterday afternoon, as the House debated another bill, Representatives WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, and ASHLEY, patrolled the crowded floor in search of Banking Committee members willing to sign the petition. Their search turned up all of the committee's 11 Republicans and 8 of the 22 Democrats.

UNCLE SAM, THE GARBAGEMAN

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the proposals put before us during this session cover every conceivable phase of life in our country. An editorial which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., on Tuesday, September 28, 1965, singles out for comment the proposed legislation which would provide funds to explore the solutions to the Nation's garbage problems. I thought my colleagues would be interested in reading about "Uncle Sam, the Garbageman".

UNCLE SAM, THE GARBAGEMAN

Not too many years ago a proposal that the august U.S. Congress interest itself in garbage disposal would have been met with the snappish reply that this was a matter for city hall.

Now, however, the House has passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of \$92,500,000 to find out how to get rid of the mountains of refuse Americans discard daily. A similar bill already has been passed by the Senate.

Garbage disposal still is the primary responsibility of city hall. But Americans now are spending \$3 billion a year to pick up and bury, burn, or dump the half billion pounds of rubbish, trash, car bodies, old refrigerators, and furniture and manufacturing waste they discard every day of the year.

Population growth, more crowded cities and the planned obsolescence built into many items made for an affluent society are among reasons the problem is growing. The House bill would finance demonstration projects, including the latest in garbage-disposal plants and new techniques for reducing solid wastes to manageable size.

It's not without irony that Uncle Sam should have to spend so much time and money just trying to figure out how to throw things away.

But the expenditure does seem preferable to being noted by future historians as the first nation to fall under the weight of its own garbage.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association, which were held this year at the Sheraton-Park Hotel here in Washington will conclude tomorrow. I regard the opportunity to participate with the American delegation as one of the congressional observers as a distinct privilege. One of the problems faced by any Member of Congress who attends meetings such as these, however, is to explain in language that the ordinary layman can understand the problems our Nation faces both with regard to our balance of payments and in strengthening the international monetary system.

On September 21, 1965, the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, gave an address to the National Association of Manufacturers at the Homestead in Hot Springs, Va. In my judgment, Mr. Barr's remarks represent a very thoughtful analysis of the problems we face and a statement of the fundamentals in language that all can understand. I include these remarks so that all Members may have the opportunity of studying them:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. BARR, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, AT THE HOMESTEAD, HOT SPRINGS, VA., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1965

Time was when international finance was a subject confined for the most part to the officials of the larger banks, central banks, and the Treasury. Not many people outside this small group understood or cared much about it. Not so today. It is one of the hottest topics going. It seems as though every publication has something to say at one time or another about our balance of payments, gold losses, and international liquidity.

This is a mixed blessing to us in the Treasury. On the one hand, a widespread interest among the public in this important national problem is an encouraging sign of an alert citizenry and ultimately it will be those outside the Government who will be responsible for the solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

On the other hand, the Treasury Department, having the primary responsibility for this area, is the focusing point for this intense public spotlight and we are frequently taken to task and called upon to account for our actions or inactions—as the case may be.

This is fair enough—6 years in American politics has convinced me that criticism and debate can be especially helpful in formulat-

ing our national financial policies. But I am concerned that this debate sometimes gets off the rails because the subject matter is novel and complex.

I would suppose that nearly every man and woman in this room has had some academic background in economics. I would suppose that most of us can carry on a good reasonable argument on monetary policy and on fiscal policy. But I wonder how many are fully grounded in the concepts of the international financial mechanism that has largely developed since World War II?

I would venture that most of us could discourse reasonably on the old gold standard that we were taught in college. But how many understand the workings of the International Monetary Fund, the concepts of liquidity and the role of the dollar in international finance. I would suggest to you that these subjects are not academic curiosities. They are on the contrary issues that have an intensely practical application to your businesses and to the role this nation will play in the world.

Therefore, my address today can be considered more as a paper on fundamentals rather than a statement of policy. Specifically, I will discuss the role of the dollar in the world today, the problem of our balance of payments, its relationship to world liquidity, the administration's approach to these matters and where we stand today.

As this address is designed more for information than for policy, I shall be delighted to answer any questions that may occur to you at the conclusion of my formal remarks.

THE ROLE OF THE DOLLAR

When we discuss the American dollar, I think it is important to bear in mind that the dollar serves three roles: as a national currency, as a key (sometimes referred to as a vehicle) currency and as a reserve currency.

THE DOLLAR AS A NATIONAL CURRENCY

The first role, as a national currency, is I think obvious to everyone. The dollar in this historic role is our domestic medium of exchange, designed to meet the needs of our domestic financial transactions. Also, I think most people understand that our domestic money supply must grow over the years as our economy grows. There is some limit on how many times a year you can use a dollar for different transactions, and as the economy grows and transactions increase there is an obvious need for more dollars to keep things moving.

There is not such a clear understanding, however, of the second and third roles, and discussions of our balance of payments and world liquidity sometimes confuse the two.

THE DOLLAR AS A VEHICLE CURRENCY

When we speak of the dollar as a vehicle currency, we refer to its use in financing international trade and payments. The dollar in this capacity is held by private banks, businesses and individuals throughout the world as a medium of exchange for their international transactions; they use it just as they use their own currencies for their domestic transactions.

Dollars held for this purpose—what we call private foreign dollar holdings—amount to over \$11 billion.

How did it come about that the dollar should serve this role more than any other currency? Robert Roosa puts it succinctly in his new book:

"Because of the importance of the United States in world trade was itself very large, as seen from most other countries.

"Because there were ample and versatile credit facilities available from which supplemental supplies of dollars could be obtained at short term.

"Because accumulations held for transactions purposes could be readily invested in liquid form at reasonable rates of return.

"Because foreign transactions form so small a part of the vast U.S. markets that foreign holders have little reason to fear that their operations would become conspicuous or subject to interference.

"Because the dollar had an established tradition—honored through various periods of stress—of maintaining open markets free of the dictation and the intrusions characteristic of exchange control.

"And lastly a purely technical reason. There are 102 members of the IMF. If financial transactions were denominated in the currencies of every nation, a little simple arithmetic will show that you would raise the 102 currencies to the second power or a figure of 10,404 to arrive at the different methods in which a transaction could be accounted for. To avoid this chaotic situation, when a businessman in country A sells to a customer in country B the transaction usually will work like this: The customer in country B buys dollars; with the dollars he buys the national currency of country A and uses these funds to pay the seller."

This is why we sometimes refer to the role of the dollar as a vehicle currency. It is a crucial role and it acquired this role for the reasons I have listed above. Like its role as a domestic or national currency, the need for dollars as a vehicle currency increases as world trade and financial transactions increase.

To summarize, the dollar is available, it is safe, and it is enormously convenient to have one or (or if one includes the British pound and French franc) two or three currencies that many countries can use, in an infinite variety of bilateral trade transactions, as a kind of denominator.

THE DOLLAR AS A RESERVE CURRENCY

The dollar's third role—that of a reserve currency—has developed for many of the same reasons that have made it a vehicle currency.

By a reserve currency we mean that dollars are held by governments and central banks as a highly liquid and dependable asset that they can use along with gold to carry them over times of temporary imbalance—precisely the way you, as businessmen, keep reserves for contingencies. But there is an important distinction between the role of the dollar as a vehicle currency and its role as a reserve currency. I have mentioned that probably the principal factor in the dollar's role as a vehicle currency is convenience. I believe that the principal factor in the dollar's role as a reserve currency is confidence—confidence in the ability to use it quickly and at an assured price. These are approximately the criteria most businessmen use in acquiring and holding assets as contingent reserves.

Those who hold the dollar as a reserve currency, central banks and treasuries, do so in the knowledge that these dollars are freely convertible into gold at the fixed price of \$35 an ounce. The fact that we have not varied from this policy and this fixed price for over 30 years plus the fact that we are the only country which stands ready to exchange gold for holdings of its currency has made the dollar second only to gold as an international reserve asset.

Foreign monetary authorities hold about \$14 billion in their reserves. These dollars are used to finance their balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses and as a cushion for the future.

While these two international roles of the dollars are interdependent—dollars flow back and forth between official and private hands—changes in the world's holdings of its vehicle currency dollars can have quite different implications than changes in the

world's holdings of its reserve currency dollars.

To illustrate, the amount of dollars (or any other vehicle currency) held by banks and businesses for trade and finance will probably grow as world trade grows and develops. The dollars held for reserves can vary with the judgment of central banks and governments on (a) what amount of reserves they need and (b) their judgment as to the potential value and usefulness of the dollar.

One final note on our dollar liabilities. While the large amounts of dollars which foreigners now hold represent liquid liabilities and potential claims on our gold reserves, the fact that the world is willing to hold such large amounts of dollars is testimony to their confidence in the dollar.

The program to which I refer next is designed to make sure that the integrity of—and international confidence in—the dollar are maintained.

THE TWIN PROBLEMS OF BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND WORLD LIQUIDITY

Most of the current discussions of international finance concerns twin problems: our balance-of-payments deficit and world liquidity.

I do not mean to insult your knowledge, but let's make certain of our definitions. First of all let's define the balance of payments. It is not as easy as it might seem because it is an accounting of our private and Government transactions with the rest of the world. In dangerously simplified terms the major transaction would be like this:

What funds go out

1. Money spent to buy imports (including shipping costs to foreign lines).
2. Money spent by tourists.
3. Money spent by the United States in maintaining troops overseas.
4. Money loaned by banks and the Government to foreign borrowers.
5. Money invested in industries in foreign nations.
6. Money given as untied grants under our foreign aid program.
7. Money sent abroad as payment of interest and principal due by U.S. borrowers.
8. Money remitted as dividend payments to foreign holders of U.S. securities, or as branch income of foreign corporations.

What funds come in

1. Money spent by foreigners to buy our exports.
2. Money spent by foreign tourists in the United States.
3. Money loaned by foreign banks and governments to U.S. borrowers.
4. Money invested by foreigners in U.S. industries.
5. Remittances of interest and principal payments on debts foreigners owe to U.S. lenders.
6. Remittance of dividend income and income of U.S. overseas branches to U.S. investors and corporations.

I have warned you that this is highly oversimplified accounting, but it does include the major items.

When the outgoing items exceed the incoming, we say that we have a deficit; when the reverse is true we say that we have a surplus.

Now some one at this juncture will say, "It is nonsense to keep accounts like these. You have current items such as funds spent on imports or money spent by tourists lumped together with capital items such as long term loans and investments."

This is very true indeed and that is where the question of liquidity enters the picture. Just what do we mean by liquidity? The corporate explanation of liquidity is the relation between short term liabilities and short term assets. It seems to me that the international economists are much less precise in their definition. When they speak

of liquidity, they usually refer to the official (government and central bank) holdings of gold and convertible currencies and the credit available on a rather automatic basis in the IMF. The relation of these assets to short-term liabilities is usually meaningless to most countries because their currencies are not used as a vehicle in commercial transactions or held as reserves.

However, in the United States the corporate definition of liquidity that relates liquid assets to near-term liabilities is more appropriate. It is in fact crucial because as I have pointed out \$11 billion are held by private foreigners for trade and finance and \$14 billion by official foreigners as reserves.

Thus, the proper definition of liquidity would probably be in three parts. For most nations it could be defined as their holdings of convertible foreign currencies, gold, and their IMF position. For the United States it is more precise to define liquidity as the relation between these assets and our short-term liabilities. For the world as a whole, you would probably define liquidity as the amounts of acceptable international resources (gold, convertible currencies and automatic credit at the IMF) available for trade, finance, and reserves.

Now let's look at our balance of payments. In essence, the balance-of-payments problem is one of U.S. liquidity. Our overall financial position is good and improving but our international liquidity has been deteriorating. To illustrate, at the end of 1964 our private foreign investments alone exceeded the total of all foreign claims on us—official and private—by over \$18 billion. The comparable figure in 1958, when our balance of payments first became a serious problem, was less than \$7 billion. This is without taking any account of our gold stock which at the end of 1964 amounted to over \$15 billion and our Government claims on foreign countries which amounted to over \$23 billion. Our overall position, therefore, is obviously immensely strong.

But in the process of building up these tremendous foreign assets, most of which are long-term assets, we have incurred large short-term liquid liabilities, which, while much smaller than our long-term assets, have been large in relation to our gold reserves.

At the beginning of 1958 our holdings of gold came to almost \$23 billion. They now stand at less than \$14 billion. Over the same period our dollar liabilities to foreign official institutions rose from less than \$9 billion to over \$14 billion.

It is obvious that this process of lending long and borrowing short cannot go on indefinitely, and I think that most responsible observers are agreed that our balance of payments must be brought into equilibrium to bring it to an end. But at this point the second of our twin problems comes into focus. If the dollar outflow from the United States is ended, how will the world's needs for a key currency and a reserve currency be met?

You will remember that I have earlier indicated that net outflows of dollars have not always been turned back to the United States. Some of these dollars have been retained by foreigners to increase working balances to finance an expanding level of trade and finance and some of these additional dollars have been held to build up official reserves.

On its face, it appears that we are faced with a dilemma. Actually, careful analysis leads us to believe that the ending of our deficit may not create a world liquidity problem for some time to come.

Over the past 4 years, while we have not changed the basic structure of the international payments mechanism, we have substantially fortified it. Just this year, the members of the International Monetary Fund agreed to support a general increase in

IMF quotas of 25 percent or about \$5 billion. In 1961, the 10 major industrial nations, known as the Group of Ten, negotiated with the International Monetary Fund a so-called general arrangements to borrow, whereby the 10 nations agreed to lend to the IMF up to \$6 billion should this be necessary "to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system."

Added to this multilateral source of funds are the various bilateral arrangements whereby the major countries stand ready to swap their currencies with one or more of the other countries in time of need. The substantial support which the IMF and the leading countries have extended to the pound sterling in recent months is testimony to the strength of the present system.

In noting these strengths of the present international payments system, I am not arguing that nothing further needs to be done. I note them only because in recent months some people have unjustifiably jumped to the conclusion that an ending of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits will immediately bring about a shortage of world liquidity and a crisis.

In addition to overlooking the very real strength of the current system, those who make the oversimplified argument that we should continue our balance-of-payments deficit to maintain world liquidity, overlook two other basic points. First, the dollar cannot continue to be a reserve currency if we continue a balance-of-payments deficit of the magnitudes that have prevailed in the past. Sooner or later our liabilities will become so large in relation to our gold reserves that foreign central bankers will no longer believe that the dollar is, in fact, as good as gold and they will not be willing to hold it.

Second, a deficit in our balance of payments does not necessarily and automatically increase world liquidity if the countries which are receiving the dollars cash them in for gold. Their reserves go up but ours go down, and the world total remains the same. To illustrate the point, in the first quarter of this year the deficit in our overall balance of payments, seasonally unadjusted, was \$180 million. But these dollars did not become new additions to total world reserves. Rather, they came right back to the U.S. Treasury Department to be exchanged, along with dollars accumulated in past periods, for some \$800 million worth of gold. A continuance of the dollar outflow would lead to more of the same, a transfer of gold from the United States to the European surplus countries with little or no gain for world liquidity as a whole but with continual decreases in our liquidity.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S APPROACH

The administration's approach to these twin problems is to move quickly and certainly to balance-of-payments equilibrium and at the same time to move forward in discussions on improving the world's monetary system.

I have pointed out why it is imperative for us to restore equilibrium in our balance of payments. But what, it is asked, do we mean by equilibrium? Is it an exact balance or does it allow for some deficit, say \$500 million, \$1 billion, or even more?

Our feeling in the Treasury is that equilibrium cannot be defined solely in terms of a figure; it is importantly a matter of confidence. Whether a given figure for the overall balance of our international transactions represents equilibrium depends on the particular circumstances at the particular time. But while we may not be able to define in precise numerical terms what equilibrium is, we can say that it does not exist when the United States is continually losing gold. Perhaps, then, the best indication of what equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments is, is what the rest of the world thinks it is. The extent to which they cash in their

dollars for gold is, in short, a very useful indicator.

We are seeking the long-run, basic solution to our balance-of-payments deficit through measures which are consistent with our domestic objectives and our foreign policy objectives, and consistent with a growing volume of world trade and capital movements. In brief, our longrun approach is to:

1. Continue to minimize the balance-of-payments impact of Government expenditures abroad.
2. Strive to increase our exports and receipts from foreign tourists.
3. Encourage other developed nations to take on more international financing to relieve us of a disproportionate share.
4. Take measures to encourage more foreign investment here.

To gain the necessary time for these longer run measures, we have undertaken shorter run measures which President Johnson outlined in his message last February 10. These consist of efforts to reduce foreign travel expenditures by U.S. citizens; the extension and broadening of the interest equalization tax; and, most importantly, the request that banks and corporations curtail or adjust their activities to lessen the balance-of-payments impact of capital outflows.

The key to success in this program, both in the short run and in the long run, is the business community. For the short run, we must have the effective cooperation of the business community to give us the time for our longer run measures to take effect. And in the long run, the competitive position of American business in relation to the other major trading countries will be critical.

First of all, we must maintain our good record of relative price stability. Second, American business must become more energetic and effective in finding and exploiting foreign markets for American exports.

Shortly after President Johnson announced his new balance-of-payments program on February 10, there was an encouraging swing to a surplus in our balance of payments. It is far too early, however, to conclude that this represents a permanent trend toward equilibrium. Some of the gains were due to special factors, some were one-time gains. We are by no means out of the woods yet. But we do feel that we have a program which is sound and can bring us to equilibrium if all of us follow through on it.

While the subject of world liquidity has only recently come into public prominence, the United States, several years ago, joined with other major countries in comprehensive studies of the international monetary system, its recent evolution, its present effectiveness, and its future. On June 1 of this year, this multilateral study group issued a report which exhaustively examines the possible ways to strengthen the system. In July, Secretary Fowler announced that the United States stood prepared to participate in an international monetary conference that would consider what steps we might jointly take to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements.

On September 10, Secretary Fowler returned from a 10-day trip to Europe during which he exchanged views with officials of seven countries on how we might move ahead to improve the workings of the international monetary system. Secretary Fowler had earlier conferred in Washington with Canadian and Japanese officials.

He found agreement that present circumstances call for a reexamination of the free world's monetary arrangements; that we should begin contingency planning for the possible time ahead when new ways of providing for growth in monetary reserves will become necessary; and that active discussions on negotiations should begin in the

near future at the level of policymaking officials.

The annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund beginning next week offers a logical opportunity to start putting the negotiating machinery in motion.

In both the case of the problem of the U.S. balance of payments and that of international monetary reform, therefore, there are signs of progress. I would rather close, however, on a note of caution. A basic change in the world's monetary system will not come about quickly or easily. To reach agreement among all the nations involved on anything so basic will require time and enormous effort.

A lasting improvement in our balance of payments—lasting enough to be meaningful in the context I have described—will also require time and effort.

The President's program is broad aged, requiring some sacrifice of many elements of the population but no unreasonable sacrifice, in our judgment, of any one element. Of course, more tourists would like to bring back more goods duty free from abroad; of course, banks and other lenders would like to lend as freely as possible abroad; of course, businessmen would like to take advantage of every attractive overseas investment opportunity. Essentially, we are asking these groups to adjust—not halt—these practices, so that confidence in the dollar will be sustained.

If confidence in the dollar is sustained, if the international monetary system evolves in a sensible way, we will have created the best possible environment for the American economy—American businessmen—to demonstrate their formidable competitive strength in the world at large, in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, an important commitment in my district makes it imperative for me to be absent tomorrow when the vote will be taken on H.R. 10281, Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. If I were present I would vote for the bill because I believe that Federal employees are entitled to an increase in salary in order to keep pace with the inflationary cost of living, the large part of which is caused by Federal spending in other areas.

MADISON VIETNAM HEARINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at the time that I conducted the hearings on the war in Vietnam in my dis-

trict, I pledged that a report would be made on the hearings to Congress and the President. I am today presenting that report to Congress.

At the Madison hearings, conducted in the straightforward format of a congressional committee hearing, serious effort was made to analyze the war in Vietnam and possible future courses of action.

At the outset I would like to emphasize again that prior to, during, and subsequent to the hearings, it was made explicitly clear that the hearings were not specifically authorized by the House of Representatives or any of its committees but were conducted by me as a Member of Congress.

Today, as I make this report, conditions in Vietnam show little prospect of change. The war promises to continue for weeks, months, and perhaps even years. The need to evaluate its causes and possible solutions remains as great today as it was at mid-summer 1965. In the give and take between constituents and their Representatives, it was obvious the citizenry of this country have given great thought to the war in Vietnam and that they individually have much to contribute to the national dialog from which the force and direction of our Nation's policy must emerge.

Such contributions are an important part of the resources our system of government can bring to bear on the policymaking procedure. In fact, one of the main sources of strength in a democracy is criticism and the role it plays in policymaking.

In the language of Adlai E. Stevenson:

Criticism is simply the method by which existing ideas and institutions are subjected to the test of principles, ideas, ideals, and possibilities. Criticism in its fairest and most honest form, is the attempt to test whether what is, might not be better.

It was in this spirit that the hearings in my district were undertaken.

The hearings conducted in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin were the first of their kind. They were held in Madison, Wis., on July 30 and 31, 1965. Spectators of all ages and persuasions filled the 350-seat-capacity hall of Madison's First Methodist Church to capacity at each of the three sessions. Applause greeted the remarks of almost every witness. Each witness submitted the text of his remarks to the chair immediately prior to testifying and in most instances adhered closely to it.

Questions from myself, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], who joined with me in conducting the first day of the hearings, sought to clarify the statement of each witness. No demonstrations occurred and the hearings proceeded in an aura of mutual respect. A verbatim record of the hearings was made from which this report was prepared. In addition to this report, I have also arranged for the publication of the transcript of the hearing in book form in the near future.

This report represents a synthesis of the content of the statements of each of the 47 witnesses who testified. While every effort was made to emphasize the major points of each witness, in some cases the points drawn from a statement

may not be the major point of a given witness' testimony. For purposes of this report, no effort was made to substantiate the facts alleged by the witnesses.

A report of this hearing is being made available to the President and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

A list of the witnesses in the order of their appearance follows. References in the footnotes are to the page number of the original transcript of the hearings.

EXPERT AND ORGANIZATION WITNESSES

MORNING SESSION, FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1965

Smail, John R. W., assistant professor of history, southeast Asia studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Tarr, David W., assistant professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Sample, Nathaniel W., Dane County Chapter of the United Nations Association, Madison, Wis.

Von der Mehden, Fred, associate professor and chairman of the east Asian studies program, department of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Hawley, James P., chairman of the University of Wisconsin Student-Faculty Committee to End the War in Vietnam, Madison.

Allin, Lyndon (Mort), chairman of the University of Wisconsin Committee to Support the People of South Vietnam, Madison.

Anderson, John W., Committee on Social Concerns of the Madison Area Council of Churches, Madison, Wis.

Keene, David, Young Americans for Freedom, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Williams, William A., professor of history, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

AFTERNOON SESSION, FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1965

Massey, Capt. Richard, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Madison, Wis.

Abrahams, Paul P., Wisconsin Scientists, Engineers and Physicians for Johnson and Humphrey, Madison, Wis.

Carlisle, Donald S., assistant professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Rice, William G., professor emeritus, University of Wisconsin Law School and Rev. Alfred W. Swan, First Congregational Church, Madison; Madison Citizens for Peace in Vietnam.

Engelke, Walter, Madison Chapter of the United World Federalists, Madison, Wis.

Fauber, Richard, Wisconsin Americans for Democratic Action.

Graham, Chester A., Friends Committee on National Legislation, Madison, Wis.

Thompson, Tom, chairman of the Dane County (Wis.) Young Republicans.

Elder, Mrs. Joseph (Joann), president of the Madison (Wis.) branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Madison, Wis.

Boardman, Eugene, professor of history, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Madison (Wis.) monthly meeting, Religious Society of Friends and the Madison (Wis.) Area Committee of the American Friends Service.

Bollenbeck, Capt. Joseph W., Military Order of the World Wars, Madison, Wis.

Tiffany, Jackson, Madison Area Members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Madison, Wis.

Ludwig, Harry, HAND, a Madison (Wis.) fundraising organization to help avoid nuclear disaster.

Barbash, Mark, chairman, Madison Young Democrats, Madison, Wis.

Ewen, Stuart, chairman, Madison DuBois Club, Madison, Wis.

MORNING SESSION, SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1965

Stipple, G. E., American Legion, Madison, Wis.

Stark, Evan, cochairman, Student Peace Center, Madison, Wis.

Grenng, Walter, 1510 Chandler Street, Madison, Wis.

Berger, Henry, 801 University Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Scanlon, William J., 222 Lake Lawn Place, Madison, Wis.

Turner, Mrs. Jennie M., 5735 Roosevelt Street, Middleton, Wis.

Weeks, Edwin P., 2309 Carling Drive, Madison, Wis.

Munger, William, 612 University Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Scudder, Bourtal, 5705 Forsythia Place, Madison, Wis.

Smalley, Louise, Route 1, Cottage Grove, Wis.

Paras, Mrs. Jorge L., 1938 Rowley Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Hole, Francis D., 619 Riverside Drive, Madison, Wis.

Kubiak, H. J., 2102 West Lawn Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Amlie, Mrs. Gehrta, 1726 Hoyt Street, Madison, Wis.

Weiss, Dr. Peter, 211 Campbell Street, Madison, Wis.

Lornitzo, Mrs. F. A., 2825 Middleton Beach Road, Middleton, Wis.

Franz, Mrs. Robert, 5742 Forsythia Place, Madison, Wis.

Mott, Roger, 529 Clemons Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Compton, Miss Betty, 2310 LaFollette Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Powell, Hugh, 44 North Spooner Street, Madison, Wis.

Radke, Mr. Lester A., 432 West Milflin Street, Madison, Wis.

Gaebler, Rev. Max D., 900 University Bay Drive, Madison, Wis.

REPORT ON THE MADISON VIETNAM HEARINGS— WHY ARE WE THERE?

The search for an answer to this question ran throughout the 2 days of hearings. In the simplest terms, we are there based on a commitment reinforced by a decade of involvement.¹ However, the original Eisenhower-Kennedy commitment was limited to assisting the South Vietnamese fight their war.² In the decade prior to 1954, the Vietnam emerged as the sole effective political force capable of defeating the French.³ Following the 1954 Geneva Accords, we undertook to support the Diem regime. This effort which appeared to be paying off until Diem, with our concurrence, refused to hold the elections called for by the Geneva Accords.⁴ The failure to hold elections, which everyone, including then President Eisenhower, expected the Communists would win,⁵ brought the Communists back into the south to renew the war they had left off in 1954.⁶ The repressive policies of Diem led to local discontent and to military development of the National Liberation Front,⁷ or the Vietcong as Diem labeled his opposition.⁸ While the two developments give rise to both the contention that the war in Vietnam is not a civil war⁹ and that the National Libera-

¹ Prof. David W. Tarr, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 27.

² Prof. Emeritus William G. Rice, Madison, Wis., p. 153.

³ Prof. John R. Small, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 14.

⁴ James Hawley, Student-Faculty Committee to End the War in Vietnam, p. 63.

⁵ Mr. Hawley, p. 64.

⁶ Professor Small, p. 14.

⁷ Mr. Paul P. Abrahams, Wisconsin Scientists, Engineers, and Physicians for Johnson and Humphrey, p. 113.

⁸ Prof. William A. Williams, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 104.

⁹ Mr. Mark Barbash, Madison (Wis.) Young Democrats, p. 237.

tion Front is not an arm of Hanoi¹⁰ but rather a "common front" for various indigenous dissident South Vietnamese, including Communist,¹¹ the fact remains that Diem and successive Saigon governments have been unpopular dictatorships which have resorted to undemocratic means to maintain their power.¹² If the National Liberation Front has legitimate complaints against the Saigon government, it would be tragic if Russia and China were the only ones to recognize them.¹³ In fact, assuming for purposes of argument the achievement of an agreement between Hanoi and the United States to withdraw all outside forces from South Vietnam, South Vietnam would still be torn by revolution since the guerrilla war is popular and has the support of 80 percent of the South Vietnamese.¹⁴

WHAT ARE WE ACCOMPLISHING THERE?

Testimony divided sharply over the effect of our presence in Vietnam. While the witnesses did not all address themselves to the same points, the ideas emphasized by each established a clear disagreement between those who thought our presence in Vietnam served our national interests and those who thought otherwise.

The witnesses supporting our presence as being in our national interest did so on the basis of power politics.

The central theme running through their testimony was that we must seek a stable line of demarcation between the Communist and free world areas in Asia as we have in Europe.¹⁵

Failure to maintain a defense line from Korea to Vietnam means we will face the enemy on an inner line from Alaska to Hawaii.¹⁶

In a detailed presentation several witnesses made a compelling argument for American involvement in Vietnam on the basis of various aspects of the Soviet-Sino split and the nature of wars of national liberation.

Russia is cast in the role of the responsible power, which has not renounced wars of national liberation as a method of winning independence, but which has recognized the peaceful path to power as a viable alternative. It has tended to emphasize this as it recognized that limited wars might escalate into a nuclear confrontation with the West.¹⁷

Peiping, on the other hand, is very skeptical about the peaceful or parliamentary path and has emphasized the role of liberation wars and armed struggle as the best means of achieving national liberation.¹⁸

The path of Mao Tse-tung has set the example for Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam. It includes the establishment (1) of a vanguard party tied to peasant masses operating in rural, not urban areas, and (2) a liberation army created for the guerrilla phase of a war of liberation. Such wars ultimately lead to conventional warfare with liberated areas serving as prototypes of the country once total victory is won. National fronts are established to join in opposition to what is labeled foreign imperialism and the reactionary established regime. The party emphasizes land and other reforms without mention of socialist transformation and collectivization of agriculture. It is a variant

¹⁰ Mr. Stuart Ewen, Madison (Wis.) DuBois Club, p. 243.

¹¹ Mr. Hawley, p. 71.

¹² Mr. Hawley, p. 63.

¹³ Mr. Abrahams, p. 114.

¹⁴ Mrs. Robert Franz, Madison, Wis., p. 334.

¹⁵ Rev. Max Gaebler, Madison, Wis., p. 350.

¹⁶ Capt. Joseph W. Bollenbeck, Military Order of the World Wars, Madison, Wis., p. 218.

¹⁷ Prof. Donald S. Carlisle, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 132.

¹⁸ Professor Carlisle, p. 132.

of this program which is reflected in the program and tactics of the Vietcong in South Vietnam.¹⁹

Efforts early in 1957 and 1958 by the Vietcong were aimed at eliminating, through an efficient and well-coordinated program of political assassination, village officials, school teachers and members of welfare teams. The total of these assassinations has exceeded 15,000; 4,000 having been killed in a 12-month period in 1960-61.²⁰ In a number of villages a new mayor could not be obtained, after the first two or three were murdered; schools were closed in some areas for lack of teachers; and assassinations and kidnappings stopped the antimalaria campaign in 1961.²¹ While Diem was not a charismatic leader, capable of welding his nation together or making the best use of aid moneys, this "Revolutionary Model of Terror" made social and economic reform difficult if not impossible.²²

The outcome of the current confrontation in South Vietnam will enhance or dampen the probability such Communist-inspired wars of national liberation will become the "wave of the future" throughout the underdeveloped areas of the globe.²³

The hard decisions President Johnson is making which close the alternative of violent change and open the opportunity for the emergence of stable, non-Communist political communities based on political freedom and social justice are in our national interest.²⁴

A Vietcong victory would be a success which would encourage Communists to use this kind of assault on governments in adjacent countries.²⁵

Others took more ideological positions. Since World War II, America has been found wherever freedom has been under attack. We face in Vietnam a new challenge to the determination of the United States to prevent the expansion of Communist control around the world.²⁶

"I am against the Communists wherever they may be. We are at war. Let's keep America on her toes so she'll not get knocked down on her knees."²⁷

One witness expressed the view that the Vietnam war had polarized opinion between those individuals who are thoroughly convinced of the peaceful nature of our Government on the one hand and those idealists who see military action as a violation of the basic ideals of our country on the other. The former believe the Government of Red China should be destroyed. They turn on more accessible fellow Americans who question the feasibility of that course of action and charge they are disloyal. The idealists would seek withdrawal as the answer, whereas withdrawal would only convince the enemy of the value of its terrorist approach. The problem is to determine and to apply the optimum military force and political strategy required not to impose victory but to deny victory to the opponent—and do it decisively.²⁸

The central theme of those who believe the nature of our involvement undermines our national interest, emphasized the irony of a country born of a nationalist social revolution should be fighting nationalist social

revolutions just 200 years later.²⁹ The effort we are making in Vietnam underscores our failure to recognize the fundamental validity of social revolution³⁰ and reveals that our policies are based on the false assumptions (1) that wars of national liberation are Communist controlled, (2) that communism is monolithic and threatens the United States anywhere, and (3) that Communists must be confronted everywhere.³¹ It was contended that we must start supporting oppressed peoples instead of driving them into the hands of the Communists.³² It was forcefully argued that we must honor in deed the principle of self-determination even if we do not like all the results. We must move toward a policy of codetermination and be willing to accept limits on our own egos.³³

The life of the Diem regime illustrates the weakness of our policy in Vietnam. If we admit we deposed Diem, we admit we used murder to accomplish our ends. If we deny we deposed him, we admit his policies produced widespread and overt resistance in South Vietnam.³⁴

Many other ways were cited in which the Vietnam war effort was considered to be a disservice to our national interest.

It was argued that the practical consequences of the war are that it could escalate, by calculations³⁵ or mistake into nuclear war³⁶ or major land war in Asia.³⁷ We, in fact, are driving North Vietnam into the embrace of China.³⁸

The moral consequences of the war concerned many witnesses.³⁹ It was contended that our leadership of the free world is jeopardized by support of dictatorships and that our support of such dictatorship is destroying the important "defender-of-the-oppressed" image of America in the hearts of oppressed peoples around the world.⁴⁰ The war, in fact, is becoming one between Americans and Asians.⁴¹

Many witnesses expressed revulsion over the inhumanity of the war. One observed that three out of four persons seeking treatment for napalm burns are women and children.⁴² Another asked how long each of us, as individuals, can acquiesce in the killing on both sides.⁴³ A mother asserted she taught her children the worth of every individual human being but that this was being destroyed by the Government.⁴⁴ Another pointed out that an extended war in Vietnam would result in destruction of people we seek to protect.⁴⁵

It was further contended that international relations must be approached from ethical,

humanitarian, and religious points of view—the worth of each person to be respected and his basic rights to self-fulfillment assured.⁴⁶ Resort to war was protested on the grounds that violence is contrary to the will of God.⁴⁷

The costs of the war and the risks of escalation were cited as the basis for a contention that we should take the same risks by seeking nonviolent solutions to the war.⁴⁸

Critics of the war cited its domestic consequences. It was asserted that war is altering the shape of domestic politics—jeopardizing the role of Congress in our Government,⁴⁹ and that anticommunism is becoming as blind an emotion as the tragic anti-Semitism of the Nazis.⁵⁰ Children must morally choose between war as a way of life and disobeying the government.⁵¹ It was argued that we are following Goldwater policies rejected in 1964.⁵²

Others cited the international consequences of the war. Bypassing the peace-keeping powers of the United Nations weakens the U.N.⁵³ and is as detrimental to the U.N. as bypassing the League of Nations was for it.⁵⁴ Our longstanding commitment to world order under law requires us to give the U.N. primacy in foreign affairs.⁵⁵ We must stop relying on the self restraint and the rationality of the very men we damn as unreasonable fanatics to avoid a nuclear holocaust.⁵⁶

The success of the Vietcong in destroying American aircraft and barracks, rather than discouraging the Vietcong, is demonstrating to them the great ease with which simply armed guerrillas can deal with the great power of America and it encourages guerrillas in other lands to do their worst.⁵⁷ Our action erodes international law since we have no legal right to intervene and force on them the form of government most beneficial to us.⁵⁸ We are waging an offensive military action which amounts to conducting a war without the required constitutional declaration of war by Congress.⁵⁹ It is impossible to think the United States can play the part of solitary policeman to mankind or to fight guerrilla wars throughout Asia.⁶⁰ We can win the war only if we are prepared to commit genocide on all the people who live there—the use of napalm in Vietnam and gas chambers in Germany are hard to distinguish.⁶¹

It was also contended that by the manner of our conduct in Vietnam we have virtually insisted that the enemy attack us so that we might justify our aggressive intentions not only toward North Vietnam but also toward China.⁶²

¹⁹ Mrs. Bourtaf Scudder, Madison, Wis., p. 305.

²⁰ Mr. Hawley, p. 68.

²¹ Mr. Evan Stark, Madison (Wis.) Student Peace Center, p. 266.

²² Mr. William Munger, Madison, Wis., p. 302.

²³ Professor Williams, p. 102.

²⁴ Professor Williams, p. 100.

²⁵ Mr. Walter Grengg, Madison, Wis., p. 280.

²⁶ Mr. Chester Graham, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Madison, Wis., p. 194, and Mr. Jackson Tiffany, Madison (Wis.) area members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, p. 227.

²⁷ Mr. Hawley, p. 62.

²⁸ Mr. Grengg, p. 280.

²⁹ Mr. Hawley, p. 66.

³⁰ Mr. Graham, p. 191.

³¹ Mrs. Jorge Paras, Madison, Wis., p. 312.

³² Mrs. F. A. Lornitzo, Middleton, Wis., p. 329.

³³ Mr. John W. Anderson, Committee on Social Concerns of the Madison (Wis.) Area Council of Churches, p. 82.

³⁴ Mrs. Louise Smalley, Cottage Grove, Wis., p. 309.

³⁵ Professor Rice, p. 151.

⁴⁶ Prof. Eugene Boardman, Madison, Wis., monthly meeting Religious Society of Friends and the Committee of the American Friends, p. 208.

⁴⁷ Mr. Francis D. Hole, Madison, Wis., p. 315.

⁴⁸ Mr. Tiffany, p. 230.

⁴⁹ Mr. Richard Fauber, Wisconsin Americans for Democratic Action, p. 174.

⁵⁰ Mr. Grengg, p. 281.

⁵¹ Mrs. Lornitzo, p. 329.

⁵² Mr. Harry Ludwig, Madison (Wis.), HAND (Help Avoid Nuclear Disaster), p. 232.

⁵³ Mr. Nathaniel W. Sample, Dane County, (Wis.), chapter of the United Nations Association, p. 42.

⁵⁴ Mr. Graham, p. 192.

⁵⁵ Mr. Walter Engelke, Madison (Wis.), chapter, United World Federalists, p. 171.

⁵⁶ Professor Williams, p. 102.

⁵⁷ Mr. Fauber, p. 178.

⁵⁸ Mrs. Gehrt Amlie, Madison, Wis., p. 325.

⁵⁹ Professor Rice, p. 155, and Miss Betty Compton, Madison, Wis., p. 340.

⁶⁰ Rev. Alfred Swan, First Congregational Church, Madison, Wis., p. 162.

⁶¹ Mrs. Franz, p. 334.

⁶² Dr. Peter Weiss, Madison, Wis., p. 327.

¹⁹ Professor Carlisle, p. 135.

²⁰ Prof. Fred von der Mehden, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 48.

²¹ Professor von der Mehden, p. 48.

²² Professor von der Mehden, p. 53.

²³ Professor Carlisle, p. 135.

²⁴ Professor Carlisle, p. 138.

²⁵ Prof. David W. Tarr, p. 28.

²⁶ Mr. Barbash, p. 235.

²⁷ Mr. Roger Mott, Madison, Wis., p. 339.

²⁸ Prof. Hugh Powell, University of Wisconsin, Madison, p. 341 et seq.

ALTERNATIVES

Several alternative courses of action are open to the United States. Alternatives fall roughly within six possible courses of action.

1. Create a stable South Vietnamese Government before withdrawing our forces.
2. Invade North Vietnam with or without bombing Red China to achieve victory over the Vietcong.
3. Hurt the Vietcong and North Vietnam sufficiently so that they will scale down their demands, making the negotiation of a compromise settlement possible.
4. Unnegotiated, unilateral withdrawal of American forces.
5. Negotiated settlement leading ultimately to a united Vietnam under a coalition government.
6. Intervention by the United Nations or other multilateral proposals.

First two alternatives: (1) Create stable South Vietnamese Government before withdrawing forces. (2) Invade North Vietnam with or without bombing Red China to achieve victory over Vietcong

One witness cited the fact that premature negotiations with an enemy while his forces occupy South Vietnam serve only as tacit admissions that Communist North Vietnam had a right to invade and conquer South Vietnam. He contended that we must stand and fight until all North Vietnam forces are eradicated from South Vietnam.⁶³ Similar views to the effect that only in a country free from Communist control can people achieve self-determination, self-sustaining economic growth and political freedom.⁶⁴

Other witnesses countered with the contention that the creation of a stable South Vietnamese Government would involve a force of up to one million American men with the prospects for success uncertain.⁶⁵

Testimony in favor of the second alternative was only inferential. A single witness urged the employment of such military measures as would insure the destruction of the forces of aggression—at both the place of their attacks and at the source of their power—as military judgment decides.⁶⁶

Other witnesses shied away from endorsing such action on the grounds that it would involve too great a risk of a third world war and would involve too much land to effectively man against guerrilla attack,⁶⁷ and that the over-commitment of American ground power would invite Communist mischief in other key areas of the world.⁶⁸

Third alternative: Hurt the Vietcong and North Vietnam sufficiently so that they will scale down their demands, making negotiation of a compromise settlement possible

Testimony on this alternative, which comes as close as any to characterizing present administration policy, divided three ways.

First, in terms of the Sino-Soviet split, our efforts are designed to demonstrate to Chinese-inspired advocates of wars that they are not the wave of the future.⁶⁹ Witnesses supporting this alternative expressed the belief that firmness is the only possible way to meet the Communist threat to our way of

life⁷⁰ and that we must put forth great efforts there against the Reds to let them know we mean business.⁷¹ Another witness thought the symbolic value of the conflict had been set too high, that references to such phrases as "national honor," "defense of free people" and the unspecified "Communist threat" frame the struggle in philosophically rigid terms, that the people should be prepared to accept a stalemate, and that there is no need to win it but every reason to avoid ignominious defeat.⁷² The same witness felt that our Nation's course was set: We must make the war costly enough for the Vietcong and North Vietnam to convince them a political settlement must be accomplished while avoiding two dangers—(a) escalatory measures to draw China and Russia into the fray and (b) signs of weakness that might convince the rest of southeast Asia we are weakening in our will to check expansion of Communist China.⁷³

Second, in these same terms several witnesses expressed grave concern that Russia and China would be drawn into the conflict before the United States can force negotiation by escalation,⁷⁴ that the current escalation risks plunging the world into nuclear warfare,⁷⁵ and that the American people want peace in Vietnam and are not willing to spend a great amount of lives and treasure for some dubious kind of success.⁷⁶

Third, this policy was characterized as a gamble, at best, with no indication whether it will succeed in negotiation or that what is going to take place after negotiation will be a communist system or not.⁷⁷ Its feasibility also was questioned. Although it could be expected to require a 300,000-man American garrison, that garrison would have to be maintained over a long period of time. It was thought to be theoretically possible, but not likely to achieve a permanent solution.⁷⁸

Fourth alternative: Unnegotiated, unilateral withdrawal of American forces

Some of the strongest testimony was given on the issue of unnegotiated, unilateral withdrawal. A single witness flatly asserted that all combat units should be withdrawn but then only as rapidly as is feasible.⁷⁹ Other comments reflected a variety of views on the most desirable course of action but uniformly rejected immediate withdrawal as a feasible course of action.

Testimony of several witnesses was premised on the erroneous assumption that other testimony at the hearing would advocate withdrawal. Against this strawman considerable rhetoric was raised.

The whole of Asia would soon be in the control of the Communists.⁸⁰

We strongly contest the morality of abandoning a free people, who lack the capability of defending themselves, to a ruthless invader.⁸¹

U.S. withdrawal—disastrous in much of Asia.⁸²

American military presence (in Vietnam) lengthens freedom's duration in India.⁸³

⁷⁰ Capt. Richard Massey, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, p. 110.

⁷¹ Mr. Mott, p. 337.

⁷² Professor Tarr, p. 33.

⁷³ Professor Tarr, p. 30.

⁷⁴ Mr. Sample, p. 43.

⁷⁵ Miss Compton, p. 341.

⁷⁶ Mr. Abrahams, p. 119.

⁷⁷ Professor von der Mehden, p. 51.

⁷⁸ Professor Small, p. 17.

⁷⁹ Miss Compton, p. 341.

⁸⁰ Mr. Mott, p. 338.

⁸¹ Mr. Sipple, p. 257.

⁸² Mr. Barbash, p. 237.

⁸³ Mr. Bollenbeck, p. 221.

We have no choice, just as we had no choice fighting the totalitarianism of Hitler and Tojo.⁸⁴

Withdrawal advocates are the intellectual heirs of Neville Chamberlain.⁸⁵

Withdrawal would make self-determination unrealistic in view of terror, manipulation, and intimidation.⁸⁶

Complete victory for Vietcong would be a sharp rebuff to American power and commitment in Asia tending to undermine the security of all other non-Communist countries.⁸⁷

Yet even strong critics of the underlying administration philosophy did not recommend withdrawal as a possible, feasible, or desirable course.

I not only consider it unrealistic in the sense of domestic American political considerations, but I consider it psychologically out of this world. No major nation involved in the predicament we are now involved in turns around and walks off.⁸⁸

I don't wish to see South Vietnam completely overrun and those people who represent somebody down there killed, which I think is what would happen.⁸⁹

I am opposed to plain withdrawal for such an effort would encourage other wars of liberation.⁹⁰

It looks in terms of reality that negotiations will have to come about before the United States even considers withdrawal.⁹¹

We do not advocate abandonment of the people of Vietnam, but a different kind of commitment to freedom dedicated to life on the land rather than death from the skies.⁹²

The United States will not withdraw and leave South Vietnam to the Vietcong. Wars do not end that way.⁹³

Fifth alternative: Negotiated settlement leading ultimately to a united Vietnam, a coalition government

Aside from the broad consensus against unnegotiated, unilateral withdrawal, the other area of strong consensus was in support of a negotiated settlement now with the frank acknowledgment that the result will ultimately be a united country under Communist, but not Chinese, influence.⁹⁴ Central points of agreement were that even a Communist Vietnam would not be dominated by Red China,⁹⁵ that Ho Chi Minh could, in fact, become the Tito of this part of the world,⁹⁶ that attempted Chinese military intervention would face the same guerrilla war we face,⁹⁷ that such a result setting up Vietnam as the Tito of Asia is not likely to be popular, but it is more in the real interests of the United States than hopes for establishing a viable non-Communist South Vietnam, notwithstanding that some active anti-Communists would actually be persecuted,⁹⁸ and, finally, that the administration will have to accept the need to negotiate with the Vietcong if such a political settlement is to be achieved.⁹⁹

⁸⁴ Mr. Thompson, p. 196.

⁸⁵ Mr. Keene, p. 86.

⁸⁶ Mr. Allin, p. 78.

⁸⁷ Professor Tarr, p. 30.

⁸⁸ Professor Williams, p. 103.

⁸⁹ Mr. Abrahams, p. 124.

⁹⁰ Professor Rice, p. 165.

⁹¹ Mr. Ewen, p. 249.

⁹² Mr. Tiffany, p. 229.

⁹³ Mr. Hawley, p. 70.

⁹⁴ Professor Small, p. 17.

⁹⁵ Mr. Hawley, p. 74.

⁹⁶ Professor Small, p. 18.

⁹⁷ Professor Small, p. 22.

⁹⁸ Professor Small, p. 20.

⁹⁹ Professor Tarr, p. 33; Professor Williams, p. 104; Mr. Hawley, p. 71; Professor Rice, p. 158; Mr. Ewen, p. 243; Mr. Stark, p. 277; Mr. Edwin P. Weeks, Madison, Wis., p. 298; Mrs. Lornitzo, p. 331; and Mrs. Franz, p. 335.

⁶³ Mr. Tom Thompson, Madison (Wis.) Young Republicans, p. 197.

⁶⁴ Mr. Lyndon (Mort) Allin, University of Wisconsin Committee To Support the People of South Vietnam, p. 78.

⁶⁵ Professor Small, p. 16.

⁶⁶ Mr. G. E. Sipple, vice chairman of the National Americanism Council of the American Legion, p. 253.

⁶⁷ Professor Small, p. 16.

⁶⁸ Professor Tarr, p. 30.

⁶⁹ Professor Carlisle, p. 140.

Various detailed procedures within the general framework of a negotiated compromise settlement were put forward. Their principal provisions included:

1. Stop bombing North Vietnam.¹
2. Establish a cease-fire.²
3. Negotiations between two contending governments in South Vietnam³ or between all involved governments including the National Liberation Front.⁴
4. An American commitment to honor the results of that election,⁵ to withdraw its military forces in favor of a United Nations Force after that election.⁶
5. Incidental variations offered by witnesses include a great-power guarantee to Vietnam,⁷ general amnesty for political prisoners,⁸ and strict neutrality agreements from the reunited nation.⁹

Other support for this alternative came in more generalized statements.

Negotiate with Nguyen Hun Tho, chairman of NLF; they may prefer a neutralist position.¹⁰

Never resist the call by the North Vietnamese, Red China or the Vietcong to the bargaining table; never forget your promise, America's promise of assistance to both the aggressed and the aggressors.¹¹

Reservations were expressed about recognizing the Vietcong because that could be somewhat of a diplomatic defeat for the President¹² and other reservations were directed against the cease-fire proposal in view of the aggressive response made by the terrorists during an earlier suspension of bombing attacks against North Vietnam.¹³

Sixth alternative: Intervention of the United Nations or other multilateral proposals

The belief that our efforts at negotiations needed increased emphasis, particularly with respect to the Vietcong, also was reflected in much of the testimony of those who felt the United Nations should be brought into the conflict.

Most felt the United Nations could serve a useful purpose in bringing about the end to hostilities essential to any negotiations and observed that our efforts toward that end fell short of requesting U.N. intervention.¹⁴ Various witnesses expressed a belief the United Nations could—

1. Arrange a cease-fire¹⁵ and maintain a truce.¹⁶
2. Enforce a truce for a reasonable cooling-off period prior to elections.¹⁷
3. Manage free elections.¹⁸
4. Arrange an international guarantee of the borders of southeast Asian countries.¹⁹
5. Reinstitute a customs and payment union between North and South Vietnam.²⁰

¹ Mrs. Lornitzo, p. 331.

² Professor Rice, p. 158; Mrs. Lornitzo, p. 331; Mr. Ludwig, p. 233, Professor Boardman, p. 212.

³ Professor Williams, p. 103.

⁴ Mrs. Franz, p. 106; Mr. William Scanlon, Madison, Wis., p. 285; and Mr. Ewen, p. 243.

⁵ Professor Williams, p. 103; Mr. Weeks, p. 299.

⁶ Professor Williams, p. 103; Professor Rice, p. 165.

⁷ Professor Small, p. 19.

⁸ Mrs. Lornitzo, p. 331.

⁹ Mr. Weeks, p. 299.

¹⁰ Mrs. Franz, p. 109.

¹¹ Mr. Scanlon, p. 289.

¹² Mr. Stark, p. 278.

¹³ Mr. Sipple, p. 261.

¹⁴ Mrs. Joseph Elder, Dane County (Wis.) Branch of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, p. 201.

¹⁵ Mr. Tiffany, p. 228.

¹⁶ Mr. Henry Berger, Madison, Wis., p. 285; Mr. Sample, p. 45.

¹⁷ Mr. Grengg, p. 281.

¹⁸ Mr. Grengg, p. 281.

¹⁹ Mr. Fauber, p. 184.

²⁰ Mr. Fauber, p. 184.

6. Channel multilateral economic and social development programs for all southeast Asia.²¹

Arguments in favor of United Nations involvement were expressed in a variety of ways:

We believe the United Nations offers the best possibility for freeing the opposite side from its intransigent position and starting meaningful negotiations.²²

It is essential that we get a third institution imposed between the United States and the Vietnamese on the one hand and between the United States and China and Russia on the other.²³

A real sincere, earnest all-out effort to divert the task to the United Nations now will do more to enhance the real needs for peace and food in Vietnam than all the soldiers and bombs the Pentagon has.²⁴

As a signatory to the U.N. Charter, we are obligated to ask for U.N. intervention. It is a realistic and honorable way out of the hopeless dilemma in southeast Asia.²⁵

Some skepticism over the possible effectiveness of any United Nations effort was expressed. Since the war is basically a clash of power, the United Nations is not likely to contribute substantially to finding a solution, although it might be useful in enforcing a negotiated settlement.²⁶ On the other hand, since the United States still has a lot to say about what the United Nations does, if the U.N. goes into Vietnam without full U.S. support, it won't settle anything.²⁷

Others emphasized the fact that Vietnam is one of a continuing series of problems for which the capabilities of the United Nations must be explored and developed. Detailed attention must be given U.N. peacekeeping responsibilities, powers, and authority.²⁸

Other proposed courses of action emphasized multilateral solutions. One witness proposed a 14-nation conference to arrange a cease-fire and guarantee the borders of southeast Asian countries and to establish a planning bank capable of including all southeast Asian countries.²⁹ Others urged a multilateral, international Federal Union for Defense designed to take on duties we have assumed unilaterally in Vietnam and elsewhere,³⁰ and an international referendum on peace designed to elicit and concentrate the desire of individuals around the world for peace on the problems standing in the way of peace.³¹

The problems surrounding the war in Vietnam also evoked suggestions that our Asian policy and our China policy in particular need reassessment,³² ranging from opening negotiations with the Peoples Republic of China on a broad range of issues³³ to bringing the Communist countries into the world community, admitting them to the U.N. to show them how we are working to solve the problems of our society.³⁴

ASSESSMENT OF THE HEARINGS

Mr. Speaker, each reader will, of course, come to his own conclusions on the success of the Madison Vietnam hearings.

²¹ Professor Boardman, p. 212; Mr. Graham, p. 193; Mr. Tiffany, p. 228.

²² Mr. Anderson, p. 82.

²³ Professor Williams, p. 106.

²⁴ Mr. Sample, p. 43.

²⁵ Mr. Ludwig, p. 233.

²⁶ Professor Tarr, pp. 37-39.

²⁷ Mr. Abrahams, p. 120.

²⁸ Mr. Graham, p. 193; Mr. Engelke, p. 172.

²⁹ Mr. Fauber, p. 184.

³⁰ Mrs. Jennie M. Turner, Middleton, Wis., p. 292.

³¹ Mr. H. J. Kubiak, Madison, Wis., pp. 319-321.

³² Mr. Graham, p. 193.

³³ Professor Boardman, p. 213.

³⁴ Mrs. Turner, p. 293.

For my own part, it is not enough to say that the hearings provided an opportunity for differing points of view to present their ideas to their Representative and through him to the Congress and the President, although that is an important part of the hearings for the witnesses who testified. It is not enough even to say that the hearings increased public awareness and knowledge of the complex issues at stake in Vietnam, which certainly was accomplished by the wide attention given the hearings in the press and on television. Nor is it enough to say that the witnesses contributed to the building of a consensus on our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Nor can the value of the hearings be judged by such ulterior considerations as whether the dissent from administration policy voiced at the hearings encouraged our enemies, or whether other grassroots hearings in the same format and serving the same purposes followed in other congressional districts.

Much can be said on each of these points and while a reading of even this brief outline of the substance of the hearings shows that the interests of the United States and democracy were served by the hearings, one must judge these questions for himself.

It is clear, however, that the people have given great thought to our involvement in Vietnam and they do have a contribution to make to the development of policy on the basis of their expertise as well as their commonsense. The catalog of ideas this report contains emphasizes that even for the best-informed and firmly committed policymaker, there remains the challenge of the ideas and interpretations on policy of the electorate. For politicians experienced in the serious business of the day-to-day function of government, this should come as no revelation.

The real test of the hearings, as I see it, is the answer it provides for this important question:

Can the main tenet of democracy, that of government by discussion, be brought to bear on questions of foreign policy in times of crisis?

Needless to say, I believe the Madison Vietnam hearings effectively demonstrated that free discussion and serious dissent can and must be heard, particularly when the institution of democracy is being challenged at home and abroad. The hearings served to revitalize the institution of free speech and affirmatively demonstrated that free speech, rather than sapping our national strength, sustains it. I believe that is true notwithstanding the fact that some of the witnesses expressed reservations about the hearings.

Whether we are to abandon the basic strength of democracy in time of crisis is a serious question for democracy which each generation must answer anew, both at home and abroad. While the true significance of this may be lost on our enemies, that fact should not deny a free society the full exercise of the principles it lives by.

In a democratic sense, the validity of our policies and certainly the strength of the popular support for them is closely

related to the extent of participation in their formulation by the electorate.

In its own way the Madison Vietnam hearings provided Congress with an example of the result which could be expected from full congressional hearings. It also provided Congress a clear indication of the problems posing the greatest challenge to the free world and the United States. The future hinges on how we respond to other Vietnams whether they arise as a result of national social revolutions or from wars of liberation. It merits congressional concern, full hearings, and full debate.

Throughout the testimony runs a strong desire for peace. This was true of all the witnesses, regardless of how they viewed the world, questions of war and peace, and the issues confronting us in Vietnam. If the hearings served only to reaffirm this strongly held belief they served a useful purpose.

A COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gonzalez). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now faces an unprecedented challenge: the challenge of channeling and containing our own Government, to insure that its operations are always in the public interest. As the executive branch has increased in size, complexity, and momentum, full congressional oversight of the bureaucracy has become more difficult. It is impossible for the 535 Members and approximately 12,000 employees of the Congress to keep up with all the activities of about 2½ million civil servants. Yet we must keep up with them, if we are to enforce economy, efficiency, and accountability on all those entrusted with the conduct of the public business.

The two Hoover Commissions of 1947-49 and 1953-55 demonstrated the tremendous contributions to the reform and improvement of public administration which could be made by a blue-ribbon commission with a broad congressional mandate and wide public support. Twenty-three of my colleagues and I believe that the time has come for another comprehensive review of executive operations by an ad hoc agency of Congress. Thus we are introducing today H.R. 11366 and H.R. 23 identical bills to establish a new Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch to conduct a 2-year review of all executive branch operations and report to Congress recommendations for change and reform.

I am proud to announce that I have been joined in this effort by the following Members: Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEITH, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. TUPPER, and Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. Speaker, the need for an overall look at our Government is clear. First, Government operations cannot be policed just once or twice. Waste, duplication, inefficiency, and bureaucratic conflicts must be constantly attacked. Procedures must be continually revised to incorporate the most progressive methods and technology. Administrative structures must be periodically adjusted to reflect the changing emphases of public policy and the changing relationships among programs, personnel and governmental units. Although some reforms result from congressional authorizations, appropriations and investigations, a comprehensive study has not been undertaken for 10 years, since the second Hoover Commission ended its work in 1955.

Second, the tremendous administrative growth of the past decade has never been reviewed fully and systematically. Many far-reaching programs have been inaugurated, including the space program, the national highway programs, the National Defense Education Act, more recent educational assistance programs, the wilderness system, air and water pollution programs, the Appalachia program, the antipoverty program, the medicare program and many more. The Federal research and development effort has expanded enormously in cost and scope. New relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments, private and quasi-public agencies, business and industry, and individual citizens have developed.

Earlier this year, while studying the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Congress became fully aware of the urgent need for coordination of the vast number of programs in just one field, metropolitan affairs, in order to cut costs, maintain consistent standards, and provide coherent information readily to State and local officials. The need for reform and rearrangement in other areas is equally obvious.

Third, it is time to reassert a strong congressional voice in reform. The executive branch in recent years has not neglected its responsibility to reform itself. This year alone, we have seen the creation of a new Cabinet department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development; the consolidation of meteorological agencies into the Environmental Science Services Administration within the Department of Commerce; the realignment of functions within the Office of Education; and proposals for the reallocation of activities among civil rights units.

Led by the Department of Defense, more and more Federal agencies are reassessing their administrative structures, applying new management techniques, and subjecting their operations to systems analysis. For example, according to a news item, the Department of State is now developing a means of cataloging all its expenditures by country, agency, and purpose.

Most significant by far is the President's recent announcement of plans to extend a new planning and budgeting system throughout the Government. As

the President told Cabinet members and heads of agencies on August 25, this new system will enable us to:

1. Identify our national goals with precision and on a continuing basis.
2. Choose among those goals the ones that are most urgent.
3. Search for alternative means of reaching those goals most effectively at the least cost.
4. Inform ourselves not merely on next year's costs—but on the second, and third, and subsequent years' costs—of our programs.
5. Measure the performance of our programs to insure a dollar's worth of service for each dollar spent.

The executive branch has always, to some extent, made policies by the way in which it administered laws. In recent years, bureaucracy has become increasingly autonomous as initiating and implementing have become more tightly intertwined. As described by the President, the proposed "planning-programming-budgeting system" will be a giant step toward the consolidation of national policymaking with Federal administration. It seems clear that, in order to preclude executive presumption, to defend the constitutional separation of legislative and executive powers, and to enforce accountability, Congress must now look closely at the Executive decision-making process itself.

We should study, now, such problems as the influence of the Bureau of the Budget. We should identify and evaluate the criteria on which management decisions are being based. We should determine how, and indeed whether, dollars-and-cents cost accounting can measure the real effectiveness of programs designed not to build machines but to help people. Finally, we should tackle the massive question of the extent to which Government by computer is compatible with self-government.

A commission can help Congress do this job by providing the information and expert independent evaluations on which our judgments should be based. As the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments wrote in its unanimous report favoring the creation of the first Hoover Commission in 1947:

The time is ripe for a general overhauling, for going through the Government with a fine-tooth comb and for casting some light into all the many dark places.

The bill which we introduce today is based on the acts establishing the two Hoover Commissions. The goals of economy, efficiency, and improved service are identical to those of the two Commissions which, under the leadership of the late President Hoover and our late colleague, Clarence J. Brown, made such great contributions to the reform of Federal operations. Yet our bill goes beyond previous acts, and expands the mandate and membership of the Commission to meet the most urgent problems of public administration in this decade.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1 of the bill declares it to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business by

the executive branch of the Government, and specifies seven types of action toward those goals. The general statement and the first five clauses are almost identical to the corresponding language of the laws establishing the first and second Hoover Commissions—Public Law 80-162 and Public Law 83-108. These clauses include definition of the responsibilities of officials, and of the functions, services, and activities of executive departments, agencies, and so forth; reduction of expenditures to the lowest possible level; elimination of duplication and overlapping; consolidation of similar activities; and abolition of unnecessary ones.

Clauses 6 and 7, which were not contained in previous law, specify additional areas of inquiry which have become increasingly important. Clause 6 specifies recommending means to expedite coordination of programs and policies in areas such as, but not limited to, urban affairs, natural resources, and transportation. Other fields in which the application of systems techniques could be studied include rural development, medical services, and international trade.

Clause 7 specifies recommending means to increase and improve liaison and communication, including the sharing of information, within the executive branch, between the executive and legislative branches, and between the Federal Government and appropriate State and local governments and public entities. The information revolution has produced grave problems in this area, and studies could produce greatly improved means of disseminating needed information. Problems of intergovernmental liaison could also be greatly reduced.

It should be emphasized that functions and services include federally conducted or federally supported research in any field, and that services include services rendered directly to individual citizens or deriving from direct contact between individuals and the Federal Government.

It should also be noted that this declaration focuses on methods of administration, not on the content of policy. In determining whether a particular service, function, or activity is essential or not necessary, it is expected that the Commission will confine itself to determine whether that activity carries out the terms of the authorizing legislation.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Section 2 establishes the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch for the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1. Section 2(b), following Public Law 83-108, declares that service as a member or employee of the Commission does not bring an individual within the provisions of the conflict-of-interest laws.

Section 3(a) defines the Commission's membership as follows:

First. Six appointed by the President, two from the executive branch, two from among the Governors, and two from private life;

Second. Four appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life;

Third. Four appointed by the Speaker of the House, two from the House and two from private life.

The addition of two Governors is an important change from previous law. It is felt that two Governors could bring invaluable experience and additional perspective to the task of reexamining intergovernmental relations and problems of communication.

Section 3(b), concerning the political affiliation of members of the Commission, requires that at least one of the two Governors, one of the two Senators, and one of the two Members of the House be from each of the two major political parties. No such qualification is set for the six members from private life, or the two members from the executive branch. This provision strikes a balance between the previous laws: Public Law 80-162, establishing the first Hoover Commission, required that one of the two members in each of the six classes of appointment be from each major party, while Public Law 83-108, establishing the second Hoover Commission, omitted this requirement entirely.

Section 3(c) provides for possible continuation of membership on the Commission, on an ex officio basis, by public members who may leave office, or by private members who may enter public office or the executive branch. This provision seems desirable because of the 2-year life of the Commission, the large percentage of elected officials on it, and the mobility of Americans between private and public service.

Section 3(d) provides that any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the manner by which the original appointment was made. This procedure would apply when a member of the Commission assumes ex officio membership as provided in section 3(c), as well as in cases of death or resignation.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Section 4 provides that the Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members, by a majority vote of all members. Section 5 provides that eight members shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Following the provisions of previous acts, section 6 provides that all members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for necessary expenses. Members from private life also shall receive \$75 per diem when engaged in Commission business.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Section 7, identical to previous acts, authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, and to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for executive departments, without regard to the provisions of the civil service and classification laws.

This provision is central to the success of the Commission, for staff and task force assistance was perhaps the greatest asset of the previous Commissions. The task forces used in 1947-49 and 1953-55 consisted of groups of professionals, spe-

cialists, and experts in particular fields, employed to conduct intensive studies of those fields. The task forces brought to this job a great diversity of experience, and the prominence gained by their previous individual activities. Their reports provided the foundations for the Commission's recommendations to Congress.

Among the individuals who might be enlisted for task force service by the new Commission, on a voluntary or compensated basis as appropriate, could be public officials from all levels of government, management, and systems specialists, businessmen, representatives of special-interest organizations, labor leaders, scientists, and so on. It should thus be possible to employ the Nation's best talents in a study of the conduct of the Nation's business.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Section 8 authorizes the appropriation of so much as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. It is difficult to predict the cost of a study of such unprecedented scope. The first Hoover Commission was financed by an appropriation of \$1,983,600; the second Hoover Commission received appropriations of \$2,848,534, of which \$83,527 was returned to the Treasury.

STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 9(a) authorizes the Commission and its employees to study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation on all parts of the executive branch to determine what changes are necessary to accomplish the purposes set forth in the declaration of policy in section 1.

Section 9(b) directs the Commission to submit to Congress interim reports as it deems necessary, and to submit two comprehensive reports, one not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and the second not later than 2 years after the enactment of this act. It is expected that these reports would be partially cumulative and partially complementary.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Section 10(a) authorizes the Commission or any subcommittee or member to hold hearings, administer oaths, and require testimony of witnesses and the production of books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as is deemed advisable. The power to issue subpoenas is granted.

Section 10(b) authorizes the Commission to secure relevant information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly from any executive department, agency, bureau, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, and directs each such unit to furnish such information, and so forth, directly to the Commission upon request by the chairman or vice chairman. For the purposes of this subsection, "independent establishment" would include the General Accounting Office.

These provisions are identical to those of the previous acts.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

Under section 11, the Commission will cease to exist 90 days after the submis-

sion of the second comprehensive report. Its lifespan thus would be not longer than 2 calendar years plus 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, this Commission would be an effective instrument for comprehensive and independent review of the entire Federal establishment. The task is staggering; but the success of previous Commissions indicates that progress, if not perfection, can be achieved. The two Commissions were very successful in initiating changes and reforms to meet the major governmental problems of their eras. Among the contributions generally attributed in whole or in part to the first Hoover Commission were the Reorganization Act of 1949, creation of the General Services Administration, the National Security Act amendments of 1949, the Classification Act of 1949, reorganization of the Post Office Department, the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950, and reorganization of welfare activities. Among the achievements of the second Commission were the reorganization of the Department of Defense, further modernizing of the budget system, greater coordination of research activities, improvement in the Federal career service, creation of the National Library of Medicine, and further reduction of paperwork. We believe that reforms of similar scope and significance could be accomplished by the new Commission.

A vital element in the success of such an effort is wide and nonpartisan public support. The two Hoover Commissions received this support. The service of so many prominent citizens as members of the Commissions or their task forces gave their recommendations authority and prestige. Nor can we overestimate the impact of the independent Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, for this Committee publicized Commission recommendations, worked for their adoption, and kept the public informed of the status of particular proposals until its dissolution in 1958. We hope, of course, that similar formal and informal support for a new Commission would develop. If it does, it will be possible to move ahead with many needed studies of the executive branch, including perhaps an intensive management study under the aegis of the Civil Service Commission or the General Accounting Office.

The final factor in the success of the previous Commissions was their wide backing in Congress. The bill creating the first Commission, sponsored in the House by Representative Brown and in the Senate by Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, passed both Houses unanimously. The second, sponsored by Representative Brown and Senator Ferguson, of Michigan, also was passed without opposition. We hope that this Congress will follow that precedent, and will take prompt action on this proposal when the second session begins in January.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to

take this opportunity to indicate my support for his efforts and to commend him on his efforts. I am one of those who today introduced a bill similar to the one the gentleman is introducing for this study. I pledge him here and now all the cooperation I can bring to see that such a study is made.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to introduce a proposal that would create anew a commission to study the organization and efficiency of the executive branch of the Government. Now in my third year of service on the House Committee on Government Operations, I am keenly aware of the need for a thorough study of executive agencies and their methods of operation.

We have in the past set up two Hoover Commissions for this purpose, one served from 1947 to 1949 and the other from 1953 to 1955. Both contributed markedly to the ability of the Congress and the agencies themselves to improve efficiency and to eliminate duplication of executive functions. It has been 10 full years since a thorough study of the executive branch has been made. In those 10 years, the bureaucracy has greatly expanded to implement countless new programs that Congress has authorized under the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations; the Peace Corps, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, just to mention a few.

The adding of new agencies, and the vast expansion of the functions of agencies already established raises strong evidence that many duplications and inefficiencies have set in as byproducts of agency growing pains, despite commendable efforts on the part of the administration and the supervisory agencies to prevent them. Many long and difficult hours are spent each day on the floor of Congress and in committee rooms as we attempt to estimate agency by agency and program by program the costs of these executive functions to the people of these United States. Today, with the expansion that has taken place in these areas, it is even more imperative than it was in 1955 that when the Congress appropriates \$10 to an agency, the agency output is \$10 worth of service to the taxpayer. If the Congress cannot be certain of this kind of efficiency, its time spent in judging the value of agency programs in terms of their dollar cost to American citizens is time wasted. In order to make these decisions wisely, we must be kept well informed as to how much of the money we authorize is productively spent and how much of it goes down the drain of waste and duplication.

It is precisely this information that the Commission I propose can and will provide. A provision in my bill gives this Commission the authority to require testimony of Government personnel to review statistics, cost estimates, and books, of any and every executive agency, department, office, board, commission, or bureau. When Congress has before it the information and recommendations of the Commission I propose, there can be no other result than the streamlining of executive functions with the

corresponding increase in the value of the tax dollar.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have stated above, and with the knowledge that economy in Government is a major and attainable goal of this body, I offer this bill for the prompt and bipartisan approval of its provisions.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his observations today and for the support that he is giving to this very important project, a project that reflected such great credit on the congressional career of our late distinguished colleague, Clarence Brown, of Ohio, whose association with the first Hoover Commission was so important to its success.

I hope that this resolution which is being introduced today will receive prompt attention by the Congress and that it will receive favorable action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of H.R. 11366.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Maryland and others of my colleagues in sponsoring a bill to establish a commission to conduct a study of the organization of the executive branch of the Government and to report to the Congress its recommendations for changes and reforms. The purpose of such a commission is much the same as that of the first and second Hoover Commissions which performed a most valuable service to the country.

Since the last study, which was concluded 10 years ago, new responsibilities have been assumed by the Federal establishment, and today the expanded and diversified role of the Federal Government involves important and heretofore untried programs which will have a considerable impact on the citizens of the country and on the national economy in general.

A characteristic example is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which was created in 1953 and which has expanded to huge proportions—in fact, to such an extent that the Congress felt it necessary this year to provide three additional Assistant Secretaries for the Department. The chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recently announced that he has ordered a study of the activities of this Department in the field of public health. Federal involvement in the solution of urban and metropolitan problems include a wide variety of programs, such as highways, air and water pollution, education, public health, unemployment, juvenile delinquency, crime control, and a host of others carried on by numerous agencies of the Government. The rapid advance of technology in the country has resulted in an ever-increasing budget for research and development. These are only a few of the areas where undoubtedly duplication and overlapping among Government

departments and agencies are widespread.

A piecemeal study of these activities by committees of the Congress would not be as valuable nor as thorough as an overall study in depth which the proposed Commission would undertake. A constructive contribution can again be made by such a bipartisan study group, and I am sure that responsible citizens and public officials will welcome such a study. I am hopeful that the Congress will give its approval to the proposal.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged this afternoon to join my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] in introducing this bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch. I commend the gentleman for the hours of study and preparation which have preceded the introduction of this legislation, exemplified in his able presentation here this afternoon.

This has been an almost overwhelming session of Congress for the executive branch. The major legislative programs that have been enacted by this Congress must be administered by the departments of the executive branch. With the advent of the multitude of new, revised, and extended Federal programs comes the threat of Topsy-like growth of bureaucracy, growth threatening to frustrate and intimidate those who seek only to make a practical application of the high-sounding idealism of these programs. With the new and additional responsibilities that have been heaped high upon the executive branch comes the absolute need for efficient and productive operation of each of these departments so that the promised benefits shall not be lost in delay and inefficiency.

It is just as important that the timing of the Commission be right as it is to have the Commission. Now, while these new programs and their accompanying duties are fresh to the executive branch is the most propitious moment. The jealously guarded bureaucratic bailiwicks that might so easily suffocate these programs have not yet had an opportunity to take hold and grow up around the new offices, agencies and, with the Department of Urban Affairs, a new department. The sheer number of new pieces of legislation signals the threat of diverted and duplicated efforts. The rapid pace by which these new ideas and programs became law calls out for the need of close supervision and the application of the most efficient techniques as these programs are taken to the taxpayers who support them.

We in the Congress are charged with the responsibility to act as overseers of the Federal bureaucracy. We do not, however, have the means to effectively discharge this responsibility in the comprehensive manner which is dictated by the importance of the task. It is true that we can maintain some check on the activities of the executive branch through the annual authorizations and appropriations, but the close scrutiny and comprehensive evaluation of the operations of the executive branch that

would be performed by this Commission is different from the purpose of any of our committees.

Since coming to the Congress in 1959, I have been privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee. The dichotomized look at any particular department of the Federal Government executive hierarchy that members of this committee get does not enable one to spot inefficiency as between the distinct departments or duplicated efforts. In many respects, we do not have the operations of a single department effectively under control at any one particular time. Without fail, soon after the extensive hearings before the subcommittee on the budget for the coming fiscal year are completed, we find it necessary to initiate hearings on supplemental budget requests. It is estimated that for fiscal year 1966, the supplemental budget requests will be between \$5 and \$6 billion.

In other respects, personnel policies, new equipment and technology and new procedures may prove quite successful in a particular department. Would they be equally applicable in a second department? We have to be able to look at the two side by side to make such a determination.

For example, the Internal Revenue Service, largely at the insistent urging of members of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, has efficiently utilized automatic data processing systems and methods to modernize the operations of the Nation's postal system. Are other departments doing likewise? Are they dragging their feet in the face of change or is it that they do not know of the success and the experience which has been gained by one of their Cabinet brothers?

The proposed Commission which would be established under the provisions of the bill which I, and this fine company of my colleagues, have introduced in the House today will enable an independent group to get the complete picture of the overall operations of the Federal executive branch of the Government. The insight that can be gained by having all the facts before one body at one time has been shown in the past with the two preceding commissions. And that insight was translated into action.

I am convinced that we can expect similar, if not better, results from the commission of this legislation. I feel that the action that is proposed under the terms of this legislation is extremely important if we are to maintain the executive branch of the Federal Government as an effective and viable part of the democratic system which is the heritage of this Nation.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been some 10 years since the last overall review of the executive branch by Congress. As a member of the Government Operations Committee and as a former staff member of the first Hoover Commission, I am particularly aware of great changes in the size, emphasis, and complexity of Government since the second Hoover Commission that point to the need for another study of the operations of the executive branch. I am happy to cosponsor the legislation to this end in-

troduced today by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Although congressional scrutiny of the executive branch is continual, there is a definite need for a comprehensive study with a broad congressional mandate and widespread public support. This need is underscored by developments at home and abroad.

The number of new Federal programs established within the last 10 years is unprecedented since the days of the New Deal, running the gamut from funds for space research to a war on poverty. This proliferation of Government activities indicates a clear need to take a hard look at the whole structure of fiscal management.

Last year I introduced legislation calling for a fresh study of the legislative budget process provided for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which would encourage an overall rather than a piecemeal approach to appropriations and the raising of revenues. A similar study of the executive budget process is also required if we are to have a clear understanding of what is essential as opposed to what is merely desirable, and if we are to establish a system of priorities among proposed programs.

On the foreign scene, our worldwide responsibilities and commitments have considerably enlarged since the last Hoover Commission. As a former Ambassador, it is my judgment that it is a matter of some importance to see whether our existing structure of Government can deal effectively with our opportunities and responsibilities.

In our nuclear age it is essential that we have new and more effective machinery to identify and get ahead of emerging problems before they become crises with limited and narrowing options, leading toward potential confrontation. Today, the Cabinet is overbalanced in favor of domestic departments, and it is a real question as to whether the White House and the Cabinet are so established as to give effect to our major responsibility as leader of the free world.

Mr. MATHIAS' bill proposes to study these areas where reform is indicated. It is patterned after the legislation establishing the first and second Hoover Commissions but its powers and duties, as well as the membership of the Commission, are broadened to meet the needs of the present age. This is a thoughtful and necessary piece of legislation and I am pleased to be among its sponsors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland for taking the initiative in introducing this important legislation today. It has been a decade since the second Hoover Commission completed its work. I know I do not have to remind the House of the enormous growth in the Federal establishment during that period of time, indeed in this session alone.

If the people's business is to be conducted with the maximum efficiency and economy, then the Congress, through its function of oversight, and through its establishment of commissions of this nature must constantly subject programs and organizations to scrutiny.

I am especially pleased that Governors are to be added to the proposed Commission—a change from the previous pattern. At a time when State governments are themselves undergoing major revisions, and when their participation in Federal programs is increasing, I think it will be valuable to have their perspective and experience on the Commission.

For some time, I have been interested in reviewing Federal policy in a number of specific areas, urban affairs, transportation, water resources and others. Recently, in fact, in correspondence with the White House, I learned that the President has established a National Transportation Council under the direction of the Under Secretary of Commerce, Alan Boyd, to review the variety of Federal programs in this crucial area.

I am always happy to see this, but I think that the across-the-board approach of this legislation is vital if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the American people.

I hope that the proposed Commission will give particular attention to the feasibility of the adaptation of the systems approach developed in our defense and aerospace industries to the solution of other problems of public policy: information, transportation, waste management.

The recent report of the President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament expressed doubts about the capacity of the Federal Government to assess proposals of this nature and I hope that the Commission could address itself specifically to this problem.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill to establish a bipartisan study commission to make a comprehensive review of executive branch operations and report to Congress its recommendations for changes and reform.

The legislation would create a 14-member blue-ribbon Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch similar to the two Hoover Commissions created during the Eisenhower and Truman administrations. It would instruct the Commission to find ways to promote economy, efficiency and improved service in the transaction of the public business throughout the executive branch.

Members of the Commission would include six Presidential appointees—two Governors, two from the executive branch and two citizens from private life; four appointed by the Senate President pro tempore—two Senators and two private citizens; and four appointed by the House Speaker—two Congressmen and two private citizens. At least one of the Governors, one of the Congressmen and one of the Senators would be from each of the two major political parties.

The Commission would submit its first comprehensive report to Congress 1 year after enactment of the proposed legislation and would submit its final report a year later.

Its duties would include:

Defining responsibilities of the various executive branch officials and departments; consolidating services and func-

tions of a duplicate or similar nature and abolishing those not necessary to efficient conduct of Government; and recommended procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with efficient performance of essential services.

In addition, unlike the two Hoover Commissions, the Commission proposed in the Schweiker bill would be charged with recommending ways to expedite coordination of programs in areas such as urban affairs, natural resources, and transportation, and recommending ways to improve communication and liaison within the executive branch, between the executive and legislative branches, and between the Federal Government and appropriate State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, more than 10 years have passed since the last comprehensive review of the executive branch. The tremendous growth of Federal activities in the past decade is but one of several compelling reasons for prompt creation of this special Commission to scrutinize the executive branch and help Congress make certain the American taxpayer is getting his money's worth from our Government.

I commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] for his leading role in the effort to gain passage of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support its prompt enactment.

PANAMA CANAL: MORE LIGHT ON THE PROPOSED GIVEAWAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, 1965, while I was presiding over this body as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], by unanimous consent, addressed the House and spoke out of order, quoting a joint statement by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on areas of agreement reached in current canal treaty negotiations.

Because interoceanic canal history and problems are subjects to which I have devoted much study over a long period of years and have addressed the House many times thereon, it must have seemed ironical to those familiar with my addresses and views that my position in the chair prevented an immediate comment on the joint statement. Although requested by many following that day's session to make some comment for immediate publication, I refrained until afforded an opportunity to study and reflect upon the provisions of the statement and their significance.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would again emphasize to the Congress the point made in my addresses to the

House on April 1 and July 29, 1965, that the transcendent responsibility of our Government is safeguarding our treaty-based sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone that are indispensable for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal. The reason for this is that where there is responsibility there must be authority and that there cannot be two masters in one territorial jurisdiction.

It was with these purposes in view that, on September 27, 1965, I made a statement to the House on the current "Treaty Negotiations With Panama" interpreting the significance of some of the proposed treaty provisions, urging that only the U.S. flag be flown in the Canal Zone, and recommending that the proposed treaties be defeated. This statement was also issued in the form of a general press release.

On the evening of Tuesday, September 28, 1965, the distinguished news commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr., devoted his broadcast to the canal treaty question in which he quoted excerpts from statements by my distinguished colleagues, Representatives LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, and WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio, and myself.

In order that the full text of my September 27, 1965, press release may be readily available along with Mr. Lewis' broadcast, I quote both as parts of my remarks:

FULTON LEWIS, JR., BROADCAST, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1965

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking from the Mutual studios in Washington, D.C. I'll have my news and views for you in just a moment.

President Johnson is going to have a serious fight on his hands, in connection with his proposed settlement of the controversy over the Panama Canal and the ownership and sovereignty of the Canal Zone, and while the original announcement was carefully timed for last Friday afternoon, which is renowned as the day on which to release news that has to be released but which the Government would like to get as little attention as possible to what it is saying, the fire is beginning to pick up and the press generally is beginning to awaken to what is happening. Friday afternoon news releases are published Saturday morning and afternoon—a day when news reading and listening is at its absolute lowest ebb—because of sports and other diversions and because newspapers with Sunday editions are diverting their major efforts toward the big Sunday morning package, so it's the best day to get news buried if you want it buried, and that's when this Panama release was made.

But there is heavy warfare ahead, as is evidenced by the rising tide of criticism from various sources—notably from within the President's own Democratic Party, and while the official announcements said that agreements had been reached, the agreements are worth nothing at all, until they have been ratified as new treaties by the U.S. Senate, and that's where the fight will come. The general prospect is that the President won't try to force the issue at this session because he already has more than he can chew in the Senate, with his efforts to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft Hartley Act, but that he definitely will shoot for abrogation of the old treaty and negotiation of his proposed new ones after January 1, while he still holds his top-heavy majority in the Senate,

which he probably will not continue to hold after the elections of November 1966.

And the people who are the most critical of his proposals—which have been in the wind all the way through, since the Panamanian students first began their rioting and desecration of the American flag in cooperation with the Castro Communist agitators—are the people who are the outstanding experts on Panama and Latin America in the Congress, and who predicted that this surrender to the rioting would be the ultimate outcome, because of supine appeasement policies of the State Department in general.

The President's statement last Friday said that the new treaty will "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone area" and that new treaties would be made, looking to a possible new sea-level canal elsewhere in Panama. It was admitted that several other sites outside of Panama are being considered for the new canal, but it was clear between the lines, and it is known generally in internal State Department circles, that the decision to build the new canal in Panama already has been made, if it can be wheedled through the Senate, which means that we not only allow ourselves to be stamped into surrendering to mob violence, but we reward the politicians who encouraged the mob violence by giving them another new canal, for which we will pay the bill and they will gain the profits.

All of which is subject for future discussion, at a very heated level, and the heat is beginning to generate, gradually, already. As you will see from the first trickling of statements, which I shall begin presenting to you in just a moment.

The first reaction came from Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which, of course, was favorable. He has been in favor of giving away the canal—and anything else that can be given away—for a long time, so his position is no surprise. But from Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, and chairman of the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, came the opening blast as follows:

"This new agreement is the most terrible thing this country of ours has ever done. The Washington concessions will only benefit a few in the higher reaches of the Panamanian Government and society, not the masses.

"I can see no good either to the people of the United States, or to the people of Panama. If we turn over or share authority of the operations of the present Panama Canal with the Panama Government and a handful of families who have controlled and stymied the progress of the people of Panama; if I were convinced that this would in any way benefit the little people of Panama, I would be one of the first to approve. However, the establishment of a joint authority for canal operation would only serve to satisfy the aspirations of a few families who have controlled the Republic from the beginning. In fact, if we were to turn over the canal to the Republic of Panama, lock, stock, and barrel, I am convinced that it would not benefit the masses and it clearly would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the people for more jobs and general improvement in its economy."

In addition, listen to what Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Republican, of Ohio, had to say:

"The U.S. Government has completely capitulated to the demands of Panama, concerning the canal and we have come home from the so-called negotiations like a whipped pup with its tail between its legs.

"The country of Panama owes its entire existence to the United States and we have continually given friendship and economic support to it. The grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over

the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States, and the United States has fully performed its responsibility under the treaty of 1903. Therefore, there was nothing to negotiate and this country should have stood firm. Instead, the United States capitulated. How do we expect other nations to have any respect for the United States, when we do not have enough self-respect to stand firm, when we are on solid legal and moral footing?"

Now, finally, Democratic Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, who is perhaps the outstanding congressional student of Panamanian affairs and on the canal issue. Here is what he has to say:

"The President's announcement, on September 24, 1965, fully justifies my fears for the security of our position on the isthmus and confirms my predictions on this subject.

"It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup, for it is an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations, that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdictions, where two masters are involved.

"The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States, with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some \$144 million. Our investment in the canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars, furnished by the American taxpayers, but in the indicated agreements, not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

"Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiation are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires, and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

"The Panamanian negotiators have written out what they demand and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the zone and the operation and maintenance of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superseded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the zone—courts, police and fire departments, schools, roads and public utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

"For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which, since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding. And it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

"Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will inevitably demand all control over the canal enterprise, with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America, will go down the Communist drain.

"The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States, although it may bring rejoicing at Peking and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers, and appeasers who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness

to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic, revolutionary elements, all over Latin America and the Caribbean."

That is the essence of the statement by Democratic Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, regarding President Johnson's capitulation to the demands of Panama, that we surrender the Panama Canal and all sovereignty over it, and the last line of that statement is exquisitely illustrative of why Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, whom I mentioned earlier as being in favor of the President's action, takes the position he does. Within the last week, he has denounced the President's policy of opposing communism in Latin America, because he says it might discourage revolutions—and has said that any revolution is good, whether it is Democratic, Socialist, or Communist—as long as it aims at social reform.

I'll have more for you in just a moment.

You'll hear much more about this Panama Canal proposal, as time goes on, from both sides. The argument will be used that the canal is no longer economic anyway, because many of the larger ships of the world including tankers and our own aircraft carriers are too large to pass through it. The answer to that is that it could be enlarged, or probably, more cheaply, the new sea-level canal could be dug, which would have unlimited accommodation. But do we dig it in a country that has behaved as Panama has behaved in this situation, a country which has actually encouraged terrorism against our citizens and the insulting of the American flag? Senator FULBRIGHT and the State Department say "yes." That's why we're in as much trouble as we're in over the world. I for one say "never," and I suspect that you and 90 percent or more of the American people agree.

Anywhere but Panama.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CONCERNING THE PROPOSED TREATIES WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

The President's announcement on September 24, 1965, about the status of current treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, fully justify my fears for the security of our position on the isthmus and confirm my predictions on this subject.

It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup for it in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdictions where two masters are involved.

The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some \$144 million. Our investment in the canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers but in the indicated agreements not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiation are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

The Panamanian negotiators have written out what they demanded and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. We certainly should not have agreed to Panamanian sovereignty but, on the other hand, should have demanded the extension of the Canal Zone

to include the watershed of the Chagres River.

The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone, means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the zone and the operation and maintenance of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superceded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the zone—courts, police and fire departments, schools, roads, and public utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

All this means, sooner or later, the elimination of U.S. citizen employees in the canal enterprise with substitutions by Panamanians. It will be inevitable that all these positions will become political plums eagerly sought by Panamanian politicians with gross confusion and embarrassment. Yet, our negotiators were unable or unwilling to deal with the situation realistically and have agreed to leave our Government with responsibility without any adequate authority. Think what this means in time of war or other grave emergency. Even as to the matter of land in the zone, which may be required for canal purposes, we should have to buy back at exorbitant prices areas we already own by actual purchases from the owners. What a ridiculous situation.

Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will, inevitably, demand all control over the canal enterprise with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America will go down the Communist drain.

For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility, is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding; and it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States, although it may bring rejoicing at Peking and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers and appeasers, who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionary elements all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

There should be only one flag flown over the Panama Canal and zone—the flag of the United States—and the proposed treaties should be defeated.

FAREWELL TO JAMES ROOSEVELT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sadness that I bid farewell today to my colleague and fellow Californian, James Roosevelt. It has been my privilege to serve with this distinguished legislator for the past 5 years, and I always have regarded him as one of the most effective and dedicated Members of this House.

He has worked selflessly toward securing equal opportunity for all Americans, regardless of their race, religion, or national origin. It was Jim Roosevelt,

more than any other Member of this body, who was responsible for inclusion of a fair employment practices provision in the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. Had this provision failed, the 1964 Civil Rights Act would have fallen far short of our hopes—and our obligation—to provide all our citizens with equal access to the job marketplace.

Jim Roosevelt has been a tireless champion of religious freedom and has been a strong voice in the protest against religious persecution in the Soviet Union. He has been a steadfast friend of the brave nation of Israel, realizing many years ago that Israel would develop into the bastion of freedom and progress in the Middle East.

To me, and to my fellow Californians, Jim Roosevelt's work in Congress always has reflected man's aspirations and endeavors for a better life and a better America. He has been an able leader on the Select Committee on Small Business, seeking to promote small business activity and strengthen our free enterprise system. I am honored to succeed him on this committee and am awed by the challenge of trying to fill his shoes. He has fought relentlessly to establish a minimum wage law which would promise every American worker a decent standard of living. He has tackled the war against illiteracy, hunger, and deprivation with the same courage and energy he used against the enemy in World War II.

James Roosevelt is truly a credit to the U.S. Congress and to his family name which has left a deep and indelible mark on modern history.

We surely will miss him in these Halls of Congress. Yet, it is with pride and happiness that I watch him go to his new assignment at the United Nations. After nearly a quarter of a century, the United Nations remains our best hope for world peace. I am confident that James Roosevelt will make a very significant contribution toward achieving world peace and lifting up men all over the world from the depths of hunger and despair.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, PRIVATE BUSINESS AND TRAINING SCHOOLS, AND THE MANPOWER PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the manpower training program was designed to equip unemployed men and women with the skills they must have to find employment. The program is supposed to be implemented on the State level in accordance with the policies contained in the Federal legislation. I am sorry to report that in my own State of Texas the Manpower Training Act, and specifically the Manpower Amendments of 1965, is not being applied to its

full capacity and in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Several months ago, the head of one of the excellent private training schools in my home town of San Antonio brought to my attention the fact that the State agencies in Texas had refused to permit his school to participate in the manpower development and training program in Texas. I have since learned that no private school has been allowed to participate in the Manpower Development and Training Act program.

This Federal program was originally enacted by Congress in 1962. It was created, as I have said, for the purpose of giving to unemployed persons the necessary skills to return them to their jobs. The program has been extremely successful wherever applied. Since the year of its enactment it has been strengthened and broadened by Congress on several occasions. This year Congress amended the Manpower Act of 1962, among other reasons, to specifically authorize the States to contract with private business and training schools to bring them within the program wherever they can provide substantially equivalent training at comparable expenditures. Congress found after holding public hearings that there has been an underutilization of the many fine private schools throughout the country which could make a valuable contribution toward our efforts at training the unskilled and the unemployed. For this reason, the 1965 amendments contain specific language to provide for the use of private training schools.

I was extremely disappointed, therefore, to learn that the Texas Education Agency has adopted a policy of using only public schools, to the exclusion of all private business and training schools. I was also disappointed to learn that the Texas Employment Commission has so far failed to even certify that there is a need in Texas for trained workers in the heavy construction industry such as qualified diesel mechanics. It is incredible that the need for this skill has not yet been recognized in Texas and especially in the San Antonio area. I have documentary proof in the form of letters from Texas and San Antonio contractors and construction firms stating not only the need for trained diesel mechanics, but the need for skilled workers throughout the heavy construction industry. In addition, recent economic projections show there will be an even greater need for these skills within the next 18 months because of the expanding San Antonio economy.

Furthermore, the State agencies have certified the need for skills in other areas such as secretarial and stenographic, which are taught in many of the private schools located in Texas. Yet, although training programs for these skills have been established in some of the Texas public schools, they have been denied to the private schools. The failure to utilize the private schools for the teaching of the skills that have been certified is a clear discrimination against the private schools and a violation of the Federal policy.

In light of the intent of Congress in passing the 1965 amendments, these facts are quite disturbing. In light of the fact that the manpower training program is financed entirely with Federal moneys, they are even more disturbing. The money to pay for this program comes 100 percent from the Federal Government without any requirement that the States contribute a matching share or even a small part. It seems to me that the State agencies and the responsible Federal agencies should have more than a passing interest in how the program is administered.

The Texas State agencies by their actions are, in effect, giving a monopoly on manpower training under Manpower Development and Training Act to the public schools at the expense of the private schools. The State of Texas is thereby forcing the Government to compete with private enterprise. This should not be permitted by the State government or condoned by the Federal Government, for it is the intent of Congress that the private schools shall participate in this program.

The effects of this unfortunate circumstance can become most serious for San Antonio in a very short time. San Antonio has a skilled manpower shortage, especially in the construction industry. Activity in this industry has been increasing and will continue to increase in the foreseeable future. But a continued shortage of skilled manpower could have a harmful effect on this trend.

For these reasons, I have taken an intense interest in seeing to it that the shortcomings in the application of MDTA are corrected, particularly in regard to the 1965 amendments. I have been in touch with the appropriate officials of the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and am pleased to report that as a result of my inquiries and efforts a Federal field representative in Texas has urged that the private schools be used and it is hoped that more consideration will be given to the use of these schools. In a letter to me, the Acting Deputy Commissioner for adult and vocational education in the Office of Education, Department of HEW, has stated:

We are gratified that responsible State officials are now giving active consideration to the involvement of private schools in manpower training. In this regard we shall continue to keep in touch with the situation through our regional representative, and we shall advise you of further developments.

But the fact remains that so far not a single private school has been used in the manpower program in Texas. I intend to pursue this matter until the private schools are given an equal opportunity to make a contribution to the manpower program in Texas.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored and pleased to appear before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is now holding hearings on my bills and other bills that would provide for the humane treatment of laboratory animals.

Because of the controversy of this legislation and the feelings that have been generated by its supporters, I would like to offer my statement which I gave to the committee today, so that my colleagues and the entire humane movement may know how I stand and why I feel that this Congress should pass legislation that would protect our laboratory animals.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you and to commend your committee for having these hearings upon this important subject.

I am going to address myself generally to two bills which I have supported but make a few general remarks to indicate that what I am really here for is to support the objectives of all these bills that are before your distinguished committee.

I want to have a general word to say about that when I complete my statement, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, one of my bills was H.R. 3036 which was introduced in the 89th Congress; and the other one is H.R. 10050, which is a companion bill to H.R. 10049, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Florida and one of the eminent members of the committee, Mr. ROGERS, also introduced in this session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear to those who are criticizing this legislation by stating that enactment would impair their ability to serve the cause of man by what they would regard as legitimate experimentation upon animals, that this is not the objective at all. There are those who feel that there is an excessive use made of animals for that purpose and then there are those who feel that they should not be used at all for that purpose, but this is not the purpose of the proposed legislation.

The aims of this proposal do not seem to be objectionable to anyone of good will, for all that is sought is that no unnecessary experimental use of animals be made, that these animals not be subjected to pain or death when it might be avoided, and if these animals are chosen for legitimate experimentation that no unnecessary pain, no lack of consideration be shown them.

In short, all we are saying is "Don't use the laboratory animal when not needed, and don't inflict unnecessary pain, and don't show toward it any lack of consideration that the most basic instinct of kindness would require one to give to any living thing."

The wrongs being committed—and I might emphasize—very grievous wrongs—are the tremendous amount of suffering to which millions of animals are subjected annually, in the research facilities of our medical and pharmaceutical laboratories.

Now I know and I believe just about everyone will agree that most of the suffering inflicted is unavoidable. Oh, and I know that our conscience also tells us that it is better for a few hundreds or even several thousands to suffer as long as this may result in the alleviation of suffering and improvement in

the health of millions of human beings. But this is not so—not to those who have been exposed to the goings-on in our research laboratories. It has been demonstrated that a great deal of the suffering of laboratory animals is not necessary for any legitimate reason connected with the advancement of human welfare. Unfortunately unnecessary suffering apparently has become a part of our medical experimentation largely because we have been too preoccupied with helping humans to take the trouble to help the animals.

The problem has been greatly accentuated by the rapid growth in the use of animals in laboratories in recent years, due mainly to financial support by the Federal Government for medical research. It is estimated that over \$1 billion is appropriated annually for this purpose.

It is estimated that between 200,000 and 300,000 persons are engaged directly in the use and handling of animals in research, teaching, and the production of pharmaceuticals. Commonsense tells us that in any such group there are people of many kinds—humane, kind, lazy, conscientious, careless, and cruel. Not everyone who handles animals in a laboratory is a scientist. There are kennel men, janitors, technicians—and they far outnumber the scientists. Even among the scientists there are many shades of opinion about their responsibility to the animals they use.

In this Congress and the preceding Congresses a number of legislative proposals concerning the humane treatment of laboratory animals have been introduced. I believe it worthwhile to review these events of the last 5 years. Five years ago the first bill for the protection of laboratory animals was introduced in May 1960 in the Senate during the 86th Congress. This was the Cooper bill and it was followed by the introduction of three bills in the House of Representatives. In the 87th Congress the Moulder and Griffiths bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and the Clark bill in the Senate. As most of you know, these bills all contained the same general administrative framework: licensing of laboratories and individuals, pain limiting clauses and inspection, standards for physical plant and animal care. Hearings were held also during the 87th Congress on the Moulder and Griffiths bills.

Since the 87th Congress, no constructive move has been made in Congress to secure passage of this legislation. In session after session these bills were reintroduced, 10 in the 88th Congress, and 12 so far in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

In summary, there have been 29 legislative proposals introduced on the national scene since 1960. This record has pointed up the obvious, the opposition who favored the status quo had demonstrated more effectiveness in dealing with Congress, and in the process had been more vocal than those who seek passage of a reasonably protective bill. As we all know, many resource struggles are fought in the legislative halls and nowhere is a united front more important.

Indeed, it has become essential that proponents of protective legislation now show a more united front, and be more aggressively vocal in expressing their views if any such remedial legislation is to be enacted. Consequently, the two largest national organizations of the American humane movement—the Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association have now been brought together in a united front. As a result, H.R. 10050 and the other identical bills represent an adequate and broadly supported solution to the problem of alleviating the suffering of laboratory animals. I believe this bill, overall, will do more, if passed, to protect the animals against avoidable suffering than any other bill that has been introduced in the

past. Great care has also been exercised to protect the research laboratories and pharmaceutical manufacturers against punitive and cumbersome government interference with their operations.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I have outlined the provisions of my bill and Mr. ROGERS' bill H.R. 10049 and H.R. 10050, since they speak for themselves I will not take the time of the committee now to cover those provisions since they appear on the face of the bills.

It may be productive for me to call your attention to some features of H.R. 10050:

Concerning administration: Full responsibility for administration and enforcement of the act is given to a coordinator appointed by the President to head an independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare located for administrative purposes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Concerning coverage: Coverage extends to all laboratories where animals are used in research laboratories of any department or agency of the United States; laboratories where U.S. grant or contract funds are used; and laboratories engaged in interstate commerce.

Concerning inspection and destruction of animals: Qualified inspectors shall periodically inspect laboratories to insure compliance with the act. An inspector finding an animal suffering as a result of a violation shall consult the head (or other employee) of the laboratory and the coordinator before destroying the animal.

Concerning licensing and enforcement: The Coordinator will issue a certificate of approval (license) to the head of any covered laboratory who then is charged with full responsibility for the care and use of animals, for permitting inspections at any time, for operating the laboratory in conformity with the act and with all directives issued under it, and for approval of the competence of the investigators working in his laboratory.

For failure to comply with the act and with directives (1) the certificate of approval of the head of the laboratory may be suspended or revoked, (2) the head of the laboratory may be made temporarily or permanently ineligible to use animals in research, (3) no payments of Federal funds may be made under grants or contracts during a period of noncompliance, and (4) at any time that a laboratory is not supervised by a holder of a certificate of approval, all animals shall be in the custody of an appointee of the Coordinator.

Individual investigators are not licensed but they must meet qualifications as a prerequisite to carrying out research and are subject to temporary or permanent ineligibility to use animals in research as a penalty for violation.

Concerning student work: Students and laboratory assistants may work under the direct supervision of a qualified investigator who is responsible for the well-being of the animals. Animals used in practice surgery and other painful training procedures shall be under complete anesthesia and shall be humanely put to death before recovering consciousness, except under such circumstances as the Coordinator may prescribe.

Concerning animal care: The Coordinator shall issue general directives establishing humane standards for the physical environment and care of handling laboratory animals. He is also directed to conduct studies concerning the health, etc. of laboratory animals and to improve the skills of laboratory personnel by training programs.

Concerning pain limitation: The handling and use of animals in laboratories shall conform with directives issued by the Coordinator. Without prior approval investigators may carry out painless experiments in accordance with general directives. For procedures painful to animals, the investigator may be granted prior approval in a special

directive. In either case, directives will prescribe surgical and other techniques, the use of anesthetics, postoperative care, and the method and timing of painless destruction of animals.

In drawing up both general and special directives the Coordinator is directed to work toward refinement of techniques in order to reduce distress to the animals, the widest use of statistical techniques in experimental design and sampling, the elimination of duplication of experiments, and the substitution of nonsentient or less sentient forms of life for higher forms. The Coordinator may issue a special directive if, after examining alternative means to accomplish the experimental purpose, he finds that it is absolutely necessary as a means of directly achieving the alleviation of suffering, the prolongation of life, the prevention or cure of disease, or the promotion of national safety.

Concerning reports and records: Covered laboratories must keep records showing, for each animal, information relating to its use and dates of acquisition and final disposition. Copies of the special directives authorizing painful procedures must be displayed near the animal involved. Animal reports must be filed by each laboratory showing numbers of each species of animals used, references to research publications, and other information as prescribed by the Coordinator.

Concerning participation by humane representatives: In establishing all standards and directives the Coordinator shall consult with, among others, interested animal welfare organizations.

Recently the Florida Federation of Humane Societies adopted a resolution which supports my bill, H.R. 10050, and my colleague, Mr. ROGERS' bill, H.R. 10049.

I offer and recommend this bill to you with earnest personal conviction that it is desirable as a matter of public morality, that it will improve medical research, and that it will also save public funds that now are being wasted. I urge its enactment.

I have copies of that resolution which I ask leave to incorporate in the record at the end of my formal statement.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, as I said in the beginning, while I think these two bills that I have introduced, H.R. 3036 and H.R. 10050, have merit and deserve the consideration of your distinguished committee, I am here this morning not to advocate a bill. I am here to appeal to the instincts of humanity, the pricks of conscience that make us considerate of any living creature which is made to suffer.

The great Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who was recently lost to the world, based a whole religious philosophy upon the simple observation that perhaps the most sacred thing upon the face of the earth was life, not human life but life, the life of every living creature. Reverence for life. All life. Not just people but the life of all living creatures was the basic creed in that moving philosophy of one of the greatest men of all times, reverence for life, respect for life in whatever form the Creator put it upon the face of the earth.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard you will recall for a long time, the words, "Poor man's inhumanity to man makes countless millions mourn." I wonder if we take account of man's inhumanity to other creatures, not making more millions mourn because probably as grievous as is man's injustice to his fellow man, it is shocking to see the lack of consideration and the carelessness that man has in to many cases shown to other creatures who also have the sacred flame of life within them.

Mr. Chairman, these creatures do not speak our language, but I think we all agree that they do speak a language. They cannot

complain in articulated words which are a part of our method of speech. There is often a dumb, mute appeal, inarticulate and inexpressible and not understandable to a lot of people who do not have some sort of spiritual capacity to perceive what they are trying to communicate.

There are those who deal with these creatures who do not seem to respect their agony, their anguish, their pain, and that is what makes necessary law and authority and for those who do speak for the conscience of a country, that does have a conscience, to step in and try to protect these creatures against unnecessary pain.

Whatever the pain is, if it is unavoidable, there may be justification for it, once every method to anesthetize has been employed, if it is unavoidable and in the interest of promoting the health and protecting the lives and prolonging lives of human beings, I am not here to oppose that. But I do say that when we select these creatures and make them the sacrifices of experimentation, the least we can do show our gratitude and the least we can make those do who would not voluntarily discharge that moral obligation is to do everything that can be done to spare anguish and agony and pain and death to those who are making the service of their bodies, or the giving of their lives, a sacrifice to their superiors upon the face of the earth in intelligence, man.

I come to appeal for these creatures and so, Mr. Chairman, take all these bills, take every suggestion that is offered here, your able committee can put it together into legislation that will accomplish the noble objective which is in the hearts of all of us who are trying to project this legislation and in the hearts of the millions of people over America, who feel as we do even if they are not here to be heard before your distinguished committee.

I ask that my statement be incorporated in the record.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Without objection.

"RESOLUTION BY FLORIDA FEDERATION OF HUMANE SOCIETIES

"Whereas the Florida Federation of Humane Societies has gone on record in a resolution passed March 16, 1963, as endorsing national legislation designed to eliminate avoidable cruelties to animals used in medical laboratories in the United States; and

"Whereas the identical bills introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of Florida, H.R. 10049, and by Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, H.R. 10050, meet the basic requirements set forth in the aforesaid resolution; and

"Whereas passage of such desirable legislation will be furthered by presenting, as far as possible, a united front on the part of humane societies with respect to specific legislation, despite some differences of opinion among humanitarians regarding the most desirable content of such legislation, and in view of the fact that the American Humane Association and the Humane Society of the United States, the two largest national humane societies in this country, strongly endorse the identical Rogers-Pepper bills: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Florida Federation of Humane Societies, meeting in Tampa, Fla., on September 24-25, 1965, That this federation endorses the foregoing bills introduced by Congressmen ROGERS and PEPPER, extends its compliments to these two Members of the Congress who have worked so diligently for humane treatment of laboratory animals, and urges all humanitarians of Florida to actively work in support of H.R. 10049 and H.R. 10050."

Mr. O'BRIEN. I want to thank you, Congressman, for a very fine statement. I particularly appreciate your willingness to go along with whatever may develop in the

refusal to adhere to a particular set of words in a particular bill.

I am sure that some of my colleagues would have some questions but we will have an opportunity in other places to do that. We do have other colleagues here this morning who must be before the Rules Committee, a committee with which you are familiar, Mr. PEPPER, in about 5 or 6 minutes.

If the committee would permit, we will proceed to hear at this time a statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

A NEW LOOK AT THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my continuing resolve to work wholeheartedly to help expand existing industries and to bring new industries to Tennessee and particularly to my own—the Sixth Congressional District. Of crucial concern is the attraction of industries which will truly benefit the economy. Mr. Bill Kovach, of the Nashville Tennessean, has provided a probing and very astute analysis of this matter in an article carried in the October 7, 1965, issue of the Reporter magazine. Believing this matter to be of interest to my colleagues, I have requested permission for it to be reprinted in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIR-CONDITIONED SWEATSHOP (By Bill Kovach)

NASHVILLE.—At one time or another during the past decade, almost every manufacturing center in the United States has been visited by dedicated boosters announced by orange-and-white calling cards as "Ten Men From Tennessee." Their purpose has been to lure industry to their State, and in this endeavor they are competing with counterparts from the eight States that border on Tennessee. These industrial promoters assail the businessmen with facts on Tennessee's climate, central location, and natural resources. But these advantages are just a gloss on the real attraction—cheap labor and dollar incentives. Tennessee, like the other industry-seeking States in the South, has frankly been buying industry with tax dollars and with its people.

Through the efforts of the chambers of commerce and politicians, industry has been raised to the level of unassailable virtue. In the name of industry, Tennessee enacted a right-to-work law in 1947; in the name of industry, the burden of taxation has gradually been shifted almost totally onto the consumer; in the name of industry, bond acts were passed in 1951 and 1955 permitting the use of public funds to build and in some cases pay for plants and machinery for companies moving south to avoid high wages. Recently, these incentives and their consequences have come in for heavy criticism in Tennessee itself.

In 1963, a detailed and generally critical study of public financing programs for industrial development was undertaken by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which includes Governors, Con-

gressmen, Federal officials, mayors, and State legislators. Their conclusion was: "the industrial-development bond tends to impair tax equities, competitive business relationships and conventional financing institutions out of proportion to its contribution to economic development and employment. It is therefore a device which the Commission does not endorse or recommend." The 16 States listed in the report had, through 1962, issued nearly a half billion dollars in local industrial-development bonds. In this category, Tennessee led the Nation with a total of \$125,716,000 (including bond issues to build plants for such industrial giants as Olin Mathieson and Genesco Co.), followed closely by Mississippi with \$102,748,000.

Although the expansion of southern industry began in earnest after the Second World War, the movement goes back to Mississippi Governor Hugh White's BAWI (Balance Agriculture with Industry) program of the 1930's. That State's consistent ranking as the poorest in the Union is one indication of the success of White's program. The other Southern States, however, Tennessee included, began with right-to-work laws and refined their recruiting techniques until by 1962 more than 40 percent of all money spent in the Nation by State agencies to advertise industrial advantages was spent by the States in the Southeast. Industrialization is second only to the civil-rights movement as the central theme of southern history since 1945.

In terms of development, the results have been impressive. Between 1951 and 1963, the total investment in new and expanded plant operations in Tennessee totaled \$1.8 billion. While most of this was spent to expand existing industry, at least 300 new plants were established in Tennessee with the help of public funds and at a total investment of some \$200 million. Many of these were plants whose names have made the AFL-CIO's list of runaway shops, such as the Emerson Electric Co., which moved one of its operations from St. Louis to Tennessee between 1963 and 1965, leaving behind about 250 workers, and Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., which closed its 2,000-employee plant in Stamford, Conn., to move to Lenoir, Tenn., in 1957.

Outside Tennessee and the South generally this practice has been condemned, first by organized labor and more recently by organizations closer to home. A few years ago, the southern Governors' conference reported that their States were relying on industries in which wages are on the bottom of the list, and that they had not been selective in their industrial recruitment. Recently Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials (NACO), was more critical of the practice of luring industry as being unfair to existing business and industry in a community. "Nine out of ten new jobs in the typical community," he said, "are developed by expansion of existing industry and it is not fair to ask them to support scum industry that does not want to pay fair wages but wants a free ride from the local taxpayers." To defenders of public-financed industrial development who cite economic salvation arguments, Hillenbrand replied: "We can justify broths on an economic basis, but that does not make them any less immoral."

Tennesseans are also beginning to take a closer look at the effect of being characterized as a "docile labor supply" and at the use of their tax dollars to lure industry. During a recent debate on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, Tennessee's Sixth District Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON pointed to some of the evils of harboring runaway shops. The right-to-work law has brought some industry in, he said, but "In some cases this industry has been interested not so much in the natural advantages of

the State nor in our economic uplifting, but in cheap labor to turn over raw materials coming, mainly, from outside the State, into products sold, mainly, outside the State. Any economist will confirm that this does not promote the economic growth of our State very much."

WHOSE BARGAIN?

Although active recruitment of runaway shops is still supported on an economic basis by local and State officials, statistics show that while industry may be sold on Tennessee, the bargain is one-sided. Figures based on the last census that are contained in the State's 1965 report on the incidence of poverty show that the number of persons employed in manufacturing industry is 26 percent of those employed compared to 27 percent nationally. According to the report, "This indicates that Tennessee may be in a period of comparative advantage in manufacturing relative to the rest of the Nation." This "comparative advantage," however, is not readily apparent in the economic condition of the people of Tennessee. The report also shows the State's median family income at \$3,949, far behind the national level of \$5,660 and less than \$1,000 above the official line at which poverty begins. Even the top third of the counties were below the national standard, and every 1 of the 95 counties has more than 21 percent of its families in the poverty category.

Arguments that these conditions will be corrected by a continuation of the 20-year-old industrial-recruitment campaign are not supported by information compiled on existing industry. According to another report made this year, the major industry in Tennessee, apparel and related products, pays an average weekly wage of \$49.60, barely above a poverty existence. Even this figure is inflated by the inclusion of supervisory personnel. The depressing effect of low wages on the economic climate in Tennessee is made worse in that at least 12 percent of all manufacturing jobs were bought through public bond issues and represent little if any investment by the companies.

Dr. Harold Bradley, a State legislator and history professor at Vanderbilt University, points out that the cost of such jobs does not end with the initial investment: "There are the continuing costs to the community in the form of increased service by public utilities to the plant, increased maintenance costs, increased outlay for schools and other facilities, and at the same time many of the new workers may be commuters who live outside the local taxing jurisdiction." Dr. Bradley and Bernard Hillenbrand refer to Department of Labor statistics showing that a \$20,000 investment is needed to create one new industrial job, and they add that it is one thing if that investment is made by private enterprise and another if it is paid by the taxpayers. In Hillenbrand's words, they are "prostituting their Government tax immunity."

Though the unions are making noticeable gains in many areas of the State among industrial workers caught in the squeeze between low wages and subsidized industry, the organizers are confronted with two major obstacles to any rapid economic advancement through unionization. The first of these is the way politics and economics mesh at a plant built through public finances. For example, in tiny Lewis County, the United Rubber Workers are in a bitter struggle with the local political forces to organize Lewis Products Manufacturing Co., a subsidiary of the American Biltrite Rubber Co., whose plant was erected in 1960 under a \$3 million general obligation bond issue and expanded in 1963 with another \$1 million bond issue. Frank Whitworth, Jr., president of URW Local No. 760, charges that the company was promised a minimum of 5 years' operation without a union. The promise, he said, was

made by State Commissioner of Education J. Howard Warf, political boss of Lewis County, who was then head of the industrial committee and superintendent of county schools. Other officials—including the mayor of the county seat, who is also attorney for the company—have denied this, but unrefuted testimony in an NLRB hearing has shown that a sure way to get a job at Lewis Products has always been a note from Warf approving the applicant. Thus, Whitworth says, the company and the political leaders reinforce one another; to assure labor peace, the company allows political leaders to screen employees, and in effect gives them a new form of patronage.

It is a relationship that the URW is finding hard to break. After three plant elections, several favorable NLRB decisions, and 10 weeks of fruitless negotiations, the URW struck Lewis Products. They are still out, but their strike is threatened by what Whitworth calls "political interference." Local officials, including the police, are actively recruiting nonunion workers to cross the picket lines, Whitworth charges. Further, the company is being reinforced by two other industries located in Lewis County, both actively solicited by the county—Genesco and Henry I. Siegel, both regarded by labor as antiunion plants. "The real problem here," Whitworth stated recently, "is not so much whether or not we form a successful union but that we pose a threat to the political control of this county that has been established through the plants."

CATCHING UP WITH THE 1930'S

Another example is in nearby Lawrenceburg, where Teamsters Local 327 of Nashville has mounted a sometimes violent campaign to organize the Murray Ohio Manufacturing Co., which came to Tennessee in 1955 to escape rising labor costs in Cleveland. Financed by a \$2 million community bond issue, Murray Ohio, has become the leading industry in the area and furnishes more than half of all its industrial jobs with an annual payroll of \$10 million. Lawrenceburg, like many other rural towns in Tennessee, has become a new kind of company town. The leading citizens who control its economic life are board members or stockholders in Murray Ohio. City officials plan many of their programs around the company's needs and desires. When the Teamsters moved in and mounted a strike that effectively shut down the plant, the police powers and economic forces of the community were joined against the union. In the end, Gov. Frank Clement, who had been advised that publicity stemming from the strike was "turning away industrial prospects," stepped in with highway patrol to enforce an injunction against picketing, thereby ending the 3-month strike.

Attorney George Barrett, of Nashville, who represents the State labor council of the AFL-CIO and Teamsters Local 327, has attempted to balance the scales which he insists are weighted in favor of an alliance of industry and political power. Barrett has been arguing for a State labor board and a little Norris-La Guardia Act in Tennessee to take jurisdiction over labor disputes away from State courts. Chancery-court injunctions have frequently prevented the unions from using their strike weapon. According to some labor officials, the State and the courts have, in effect, become arms of the company in what is essentially an economic struggle.

With these forces operating against union activities, Barrett and others believe that the second major problem confronting unionization in the South today is the ineffectiveness of the NLRB. "The NLRB over the years has bogged down in bureaucracy and has become almost sterile," Barrett said. "In many cases the regional men they send down South have been dealing with the extremely sophisticated labor problems in the East where the unions and companies are com-

peting on the base of 30 years' experience. There is nothing sophisticated about the movement here. We are still trying to catch up with the 1930's." The NLRB, he said, is of little help in the central issue of getting plants to accept unions, and its machinery is so slow and cumbersome that a struggling union could easily disappear from the scene while awaiting needed decisions.

The next few years promise major changes in the rules under which shopping for industries is carried out. The Johnson administration is seeking repeal of section 14(b), which would negate State right-to-work laws—probably the least important of the tools now used to lure industry from States with powerful union organizations. More importantly, the industrial-bond acts are coming under heavy criticism, and State officials fear congressional action that will rescind the tax-exempt status of such bonds. One portent of such action was contained in the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations' 1963 report: "The National Government is concerned because the financing method employed usually involves the dispensation of a Federal subsidy (through tax-free bonds) to private interests by a third party, in this case a local or a State government. It may be justified therefore, in taking such steps as it deems necessary to insure that subsidies dispensed at its expense are not dissipated or exploited for private advantage." The report concluded that the effect of these activities "on the fairness of the Federal tax system, the efficient operation of the money markets, the dispersal of industry, employment and unemployment, and the condition of the national economy" demonstrates that they have become a matter of national interest.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, within its short history, this country's accomplishments have been so rapid that most of us accept them without second thought.

In virtually every field of endeavor which excites the imagination of man—science, medicine, business—we have moved faster and farther than any civilization before us.

In only one area have we persistently lagged, and it is to the credit of this administration and this Congress that we have moved, in a small but albeit important way, to remedy the situation.

I am speaking of the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, which is a first step in the proper direction.

I was most interested to note that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an editorial printed on September 20, called this step significant because it provides "encouragement."

The Post-Dispatch's comments will be of interest to many of my colleagues. It follows:

ENCOURAGEMENT FUND FOR ART

Congress has given President Johnson a small Federal program for the arts that still

represents a radical departure in national policy. The bill establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities with a \$21 million appropriation. Direct Federal subsidies for the arts are new in the United States, but this Nation is only catching up with most of the Western world.

Critics of the program in Congress said much the same thing that opponents of the new State Council on the Arts said in the Missouri Legislature—the program would give Government too much power over the arts. In either case, the answer is that the money provided is not enough to control any art. The Federal fund would not even create one major museum. And most of it will be used to match local and private efforts in the arts and humanities.

The Federal program, like the smaller State program, is intended to provide encouragement, and this is the significance of it. The United States is entirely mature enough to display a national concern for matters which have always marked truly great societies.

H.R. 11322

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 11322, which has been referred to the Education and Labor Committee. I am hopeful that hearings on this bill will be started soon.

My legislation, when enacted, will provide for each child the opportunity for a good start. This good start will enable him to overcome his handicaps or to prevent the development of handicaps. These handicaps are great cripples which adversely affect the proper development of our young people. Even though our country has a great system of education, it is obvious that still far too many children are failing to make successful use of our schools. This failure in educational development leads many a student to become a dropout, unemployable, delinquent, maladjusted, criminal, or psychotic.

It is a proven scientific fact that much of this behavior can be recognized, corrected, or prevented at an early age.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that immediate national action must be taken to prevent the spiraling increase of crime—the appalling waste of mental illness. Our failure to prevent and correct these problems has become a national disgrace.

If we were developing a program to prevent floods on a river we would commence our prevention and correction work at the beginning of the stream, at the headwaters, not at the point that the flood becomes a disaster. We start at the point where the causes of the problem are found—that, Mr. Speaker, is the philosophy of my legislation. I seek to begin the prevention and corrective process at an early age—at a time when personality, character, and ability are still being developed.

Yes, there will always be a need for courts, jails, and hospitals, but I believe

prevention and early correction is sounder and wiser than waiting until an individual disaster is at hand. My program deals with correcting the causes at an early age rather than treating the results.

Mr. Speaker, this must be a national program because our problem is national in scope. Our people are highly mobile and to attack it on a piecemeal basis would result in a great waste of our resources.

Of course, this program of early prevention and correction will require funds to support it but when one measures the savings that will result in lives and dollars, the cost is nil. Money spent on this program is not a cost, it is a sound, basic investment in human resources. As an illustration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation tells us that the cost of crime in the United States is \$26 billion a year and is increasing at a rapid rate. Even a small savings—and I believe the savings will be large—in this area alone will more than pay for this program.

This new program will require highly trained people and their training will take some time, but as I conceive this program, it should be in full operation throughout the United States within 10 years—then all children, their families, and schools will have the benefit of this good start program. The early prevention and correction will commence in the preschool years and extend through the third grade. After that time, it is believed that sufficient adjustment will have been made in the learning process to enable most persons to lead successful lives. In these early years, research shows us, that the greatest good can be accomplished in working with human development—this is what I mean by "good start."

Funds appropriated under this program will be spent to train talented persons as child development specialists; to pay the salaries of such specialists after they have been trained and employed; for the general administration of the program; and to pay the costs of conferences which will bring together school personnel, community personnel, and child development specialists to develop a well-knit team approach in solution of these problems.

The program would commence in fiscal year 1966 with an appropriation of \$19,250,000. Most of these funds would be used for training. Training in most instances would be for 2 years of postgraduate work. In the second year, fiscal year 1967, appropriations would be \$60,800,000 to be used for training and salaries of the first specialists as they commence work. For fiscal year 1968, funds would be appropriated in the amount of \$99,250,000 since the program would be expanding rapidly by the third year; for fiscal year 1969, \$157,500,000; and for fiscal year 1970, \$236,250,000 would be appropriated. When this program is fully developed, in the 10th year, I estimate that the annual Federal expenditure will amount to \$516,750,000.

By this time, we will have 55,000 child development specialists working with children, their families, their schools, and communities. This will be a na-

tionwide program of early prevention and correction of the problems that can wreck a life.

How will this new program work? I propose that we make available the services of a highly trained, highly skilled child development specialist in the first three grades of elementary school and in preschool. These specialists will be available in sufficient quantity to provide at least 1 specialist for each 350 children in those grades of school. This specialist would work with the teacher, the principal, other school personnel, and the family, and will utilize available community resources in the early detection, correction, and prevention of delinquency and other disruptive behavior problems. Because it is these problems which when fully developed, and when piled upon other problems, lead to our great social ills, culminating in unemployment, crime, and mental illness.

I know it is impossible to fully describe this legislation in one brief speech. I have prepared a set of questions and answers which will help explain this legislation. I include them herewith:

1. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer: To help children with problems early enough in their life so that such help can be effective for the child and for society. The specific intent of the bill in carrying out this objective is to help preschool and primary grade teachers who are able to spot such beginning learning and behavior problems in children to cope more effectively and do something about the problem in its early stages.

2. What is the need for this bill?

Answer: This bill is an attempt to deal with such problems as school dropouts, juvenile crime, emotional illnesses and social incompetence in a preventive and positive way. There is sufficient research to point to the fact that children who later drop out of school are clearly recognizable in the first few grades. It is also evident that adolescents and adults who find themselves handicapped educationally, emotionally, and vocationally could have been helped more economically and effectively if help were instituted prior to the full development of the problem. This bill would maximize the possibilities presented to a preschool or primary grade teacher to head off or redirect beginning problems among children.

3. What does this bill propose to do that can't be accomplished under present legislation?

Answer: Present legislation does not provide for this kind of program nor does it provide for the training of such personnel. There is nothing in the National Defense Education Act which could be substituted or modified to do this job.

4. What group of people will be touched by this legislation?

Answer: The group of people most touched by this bill will be teachers of young children (4 to 9 years) and parents of young children. Parents and teachers interested in helping children get off to a good start in school and in life and especially those parents and children who are having some difficulty in getting started will be able to profit by this program.

5. Why do you stop after the third grade?

Answer: I do not want the services of the child development specialist to be diluted and spread out so that little prevention is done. This is not to say that services in the upper grades are not necessary or desirable. However in this program I would like to concentrate on the early grades and hope that as a result we can reduce the number

and severity of problems moving into the upper grades.

6. What will happen to the child after that?

Answer: I hope that school personnel and community mental health services will be available for children who cannot be helped through this program.

7. How much is this program going to cost?

Answer: Not much when you compare it to what it's costing us in remedial, corrective, rehabilitation, and treatment programs. This is an investment in healthy development of greater numbers of children.

8. How do you justify the cost?

Answer: The money will be spent on the prevention of problems with the usual ratio of 1 ounce of prevention equalling 16 of cure.

9. Why should this be a Federal program? Shouldn't the States participate in this program by matching funds?

Answer: Our society has become highly mobile and great numbers of children fall between the cracks. Children move; buildings and roads do not. The States will be participating in the planning and utilizing of such personnel and developing additional resources when required.

10. What is a child development specialist, and how does he differ from a guidance counselor or school psychologist, or school social worker?

Answer: A child development specialist as we have defined him in this bill is a professional person with skill and sensitivity in working with people and with knowledge and competence in being able to understand the problems of children and help those who seem to be unable to cope. The 2-year training program suggested for such persons will include work in personality theory, management of individuals in groups, the school as a social system, abnormal psychology, child growth and development, counseling with parents, utilization of community resources, consultation processes, remedial techniques in basic school subjects and extensive field experiences.

11. What will a specialist do?

Answer: Primarily the child development specialist will help the teacher with children who are showing signs of educational or emotional distress. The child development specialist will also help the teacher work with parents, work with some parents directly, help families who need other community resources and be available to other school staff as an expert in child development and maldevelopment.

12. Is there any research that shows this program has been effective in the past?

Answer: There are a number of school districts in which child development specialists are now employed and utilized effectively. Research supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (Newton and Brown, South Carolina; Gildewell and Stringer, St. Louis; Cowen and Zex, Rochester, N.Y.), the U.S. Office of Education (Lambert, Calif.), and various State groups (the New York State Youth Commission in 1952 and the California State Legislature in 1957). (See Bower, Eli M., "Early Identification of Emotionally Handicapped Children in School," Charles C. Thomas, 1960.)

13. On what basis is this program being proposed?

Answer: This program is being proposed on the basis that assisting the teacher and the parent when problems are in their beginning stages will have the highest preventive payoff. It is also felt that the addition of the child development specialist will have the greatest acceptance by the school.

14. How will the specialist work with parents and other community resources?

Answer: The child development specialist will be available to parents and attempt to work closely with those parents who feel a greater need for such help. Where parents

and children need help beyond the school, the child development specialist will assist in deciding on and locating needed community resources.

15. How can this program help parents?

Answer: Many parents have heightened anxieties and problems when their children start school. Often this anxiety can be relieved by information, understanding, or some knowledge about a specific child's growth and development problems. In any case, the child development specialist is always available to parents in matters relevant to his training.

16. What will be the relationship of the child development specialist to the teacher and the school principal?

Answer: The child development specialist will be a full-fledged member of the school staff but will not be in any line or administrative relationship to the principal. As a specialist the child development specialist would not be responsible for teacher evaluations, grades, personnel selection, or any other activity of an administrative nature.

17. How will the program contribute to the curtailment of crime? Serious mental illness? Delinquency?

Answer: I hope that this program can have a significant impact on our social ills. While it may be difficult to prove conclusively that the work of a child development specialist reduces social and individual problems among children, research studies indicate that this may be one effective start. All programs will be asked to keep adequate records and evaluate their effects over time.

18. How will this program help the normal child?

Answer: I feel this is one of the strengths of the program. The child development specialist in helping the teacher or parent is helping other children as well. The focus of the program is on how to help children be more effective in learning and in their behavior. This applies not only to the child with an overload of problems but to the child with normal problems.

19. Why should this program function in the private school as well as public school (or, why should this program be offered to the private as well as the public school)?

Answer: All children, parents and teachers should have such help available whether in public or private schools.

20. Why do teachers need this type of service?

Answer: While many teachers have had excellent training in child growth and the the problems of children in school the normal teacher education program cannot devote too much time or content to this area. Teachers feel obligated to succeed with every child in their class and rightly so. To help, they want someone who is around all the time who can work with them.

21. Why do parents need this type of service?

Answer: While most parents do all right on their own, some parents need and seek help wherever and whenever it is available. In addition competent parents often seek out child development specialists to discuss the enhancement of their child's growth and how to increase their knowledge and understanding as parents.

22. Why would this type of service help community agencies?

Answer: They would have someone in the school they could count on as a liaison person as well as someone knowledgeable about the resources and alternatives for children being helped in their agencies.

23. Why not help families directly?

Answer: This is not intended to replace direct services in a school or community. Some families will need specific treatment, care, support and rehabilitation. It is hoped that this program may reduce the number of those needing treatment services but such

effects may not be evident if at all for many years.

24. To what segments of the population is this program addressed?

Answer: This program is addressed to all segments of the population whose children are enrolled in preschool programs and school programs up to and including grade 3.

25. Is this problem most prevalent in the slums? Is it aimed at just the slum area—or is it needed in the upper middle class?

Answer: All sections of our society will be able to profit from this program. It is equally applicable to middle class neighborhoods as poor or slum areas.

26. Are there courses presently available in the universities?

Answer: There are some but only in connection with lengthier doctoral programs. We hope the training program can be effectively constructed for a 2-year graduate sequence so that sufficient numbers of such personnel can be made available to the schools and families of the Nation.

27. Can the courses be developed with reasonable speed?

Answer: I think so.

28. Will the Federal Government prescribe a course of study?

Answer: No. As a matter of fact, we hope to encourage a variety of training approaches so that the best may emerge after a period of time. Each school will of course be free to try its own ways of preparing persons for this program.

29. To what extent will this program stigmatize a child and his family?

Answer: There is no labeling or stigmatizing a child, parent or family. The goal of the program is to help the teacher help the child. The philosophy of the program is to help the child in the regular classroom. In cases where there are severe behavior problems and the child needs to be removed to protect the teacher and the rest of the class the child development specialist would help the child and his family find adequate community resources to help the child return to school.

30. Who can qualify for training under the program?

Answer: Anyone with a college degree and potential skill in the competencies required in this position.

31. How can universities be chosen to participate in this program?

Answer: Universities in this program would be chosen on the basis of a good program including adequate field training and internship. It is probable that State education agencies might form an advisory committee to set up some standards for the program.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have this day submitted a bill which is identical to H.R. 11310, introduced yesterday by the Honorable James Roosevelt. This may be the last bill this session of which this distinguished gentleman from California will be the author, since he made public yesterday his resignation from this body effective September 30.

In his statement on introducing H.R. 11310, Congressman Roosevelt expressed the hope that his colleagues would carry

on and in particular give this matter serious consideration next year.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, which will simply bring the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act into accord with current policy relating to disability payments. The basic concept that benefits should equal two-thirds of average weekly earnings has been thwarted by the setting of a \$70 ceiling on weekly benefits. This ceiling is far below two-thirds of the average weekly earnings of many of the workers covered by this legislation.

The other Federal statute in this field, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, covers Federal employees' disabilities and has a \$525 monthly ceiling which was established as far back as 1949. And legislation is being considered to raise this ceiling substantially.

The inequity between these two laws is further highlighted by the greater hazards present in the work of the longshoremen, stevedores, ship repairmen, harbor workers and other employees engaged in employment on the navigable waters of the United States.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill to support the aim expressed in Congressman Roosevelt's statement on H.R. 11310 and to provide disability benefits for those covered by the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act that are more in keeping with the realities of present-day wage and cost factors than those in the present law.

CLEVELAND VETERANS HOSPITAL TO BECOME STATE FACILITY FOR CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informed me today that it has authorized the transfer of the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital to the Ohio Department of Hygiene and Corrections for use as a diagnostic, treatment, training, and educational facility for the mentally retarded.

I have also been assured by the Veterans' Administration that the valuable equipment in the hospital desired by the State will be given to the State.

The General Services Administration is preparing the necessary conveyance documents to complete the formal transfer of these Federal facilities to the State of Ohio. I have conferred with Governor Rhodes on several occasions about this project and he has given his enthusiastic support.

A number of different proposals had been made for the disposition of this hospital facility. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that the use of this facility for the mentally retarded would be in the highest public interest.

I am gratified by this decision because I have been working over many months to have this Federal facility turned over to the State of Ohio for this purpose. There is a great and urgent need for such facilities to help many families in Greater

Cleveland and in northern Ohio. No such facility exists today in the Cleveland area. There are long waiting lists for admission to the limited facilities elsewhere in the State which necessitates relatives bearing undue hardships.

The Cleveland Parents Volunteer Association for Retarded Children and its President, Anthony O. Calabrese, Jr., have worked with me to convince the Federal authorities of Cleveland's need for the care of mentally retarded children and the suitability of Broadview Heights veterans facility for this purpose.

Early this year, the announcement of the closing of 11 of the 169 veterans hospitals stirred up considerable interest. One of these hospitals was the Broadview Heights Hospital near Brecksville, Ohio, which serves my constituents. On February 10, 1965, I addressed a letter to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. I expressed the hope that the committee would recommend keeping the 11 hospitals open until a more searching study could be made of this very important problem affecting not only the veterans, but their families and our entire community.

In order clearly to ascertain the facts on the closing of Broadview Heights Hospital, I had extensive communications and many meetings with representatives of the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, members of the Ohio State Senate and the public health authorities of the State of Ohio. I consulted with Mr. W. J. Driver, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Honorable James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio.

After a series of conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration, I was assured that the needs of the veterans in the Cleveland area would be amply and quickly provided for. I came to the conclusion that it was in the best interest of the people of Ohio to convert this facility into a hospital for the treatment of the mentally retarded. I approached the problem from the point of view of what was best for my constituents and the people of Ohio. I have long advocated better and more prompt medical attention for veterans.

Gov. James A. Rhodes desired that the Broadview Heights Hospital be made available for the care of the mentally retarded. The veterans desired that it be retained more or less along the present lines. In my opinion, both problems rated equal priority. But, it was obvious that an impasse existed and a solution satisfactory to all had to be found. At the time when I was studying the details in order to arrive at a decision, there were 423 veterans on waiting lists for treatment in the Cleveland area, all non-service, nonemergency cases. However, 1,300 mentally retarded individuals from the Cleveland area were being treated in hospitals 100 to 400 miles from the city. This placed undue hardships on the families.

The Veterans' Administration, at my request moved swiftly to solve the waiting period of veterans cases in the Cleve-

land area. The Brecksville facilities were increased to handle 106 more cases and they began to expand the regional facilities to treat 637 more medical and surgical cases.

There were 350 mentally retarded, who desperately needed care and treatment. In a series of letters to Governor Rhodes and Mr. Martin A. Janis, Director, Department of Mental Hygiene and Corrections, I assured them of my fullest cooperation and assistance. This effort came to a successful and satisfactory conclusion today.

The Broadview Hospital will be a welcome and valuable addition to the facilities of the State of Ohio. In addition to the building and land, the Veterans' Administration has agreed to give the State of Ohio its choice of the modern and expensive equipment in the hospital. The engineering layout, kitchen equipment, and X-ray machinery and equipment are all in excellent condition. In addition the hospital is superbly equipped with modern facilities for the care and treatment of patients, including a medical laboratory, a clinical and research laboratory, a surgical unit and a complete radiology service. There are presently approximately 300 full-time employees comprising a complete team of professional, technical, and administrative personnel. The number of employees will increase substantially as the hospital receives a full complement of patients. This increase will assist employment in the area as well as furnishing care for the mentally retarded.

I am most proud of my participation in this worthwhile project and wish to thank all those who participated in bringing this valuable addition to the needs of the people of Cleveland and the State of Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for Friday, October 1, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (at the request of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon), for Thursday, September 30, and Friday, October 1, 1965, on account of official business for his district.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. MATHIAS, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, on October 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McMILLAN (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter while in Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 10281.

Mr. BRADEMAM.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 596. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2580. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 205. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; and

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 1, 1965, at 10 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1629. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site (H. Doc. No. 296); to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

1630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property, pursuant to section 404(d) of Public Law 81-152, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1631. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, the Federal citizens of the United States from performing pro rata charters unless authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1632. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting annual report of the directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1633. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a plan for works of improvement which has been prepared for the Plain-Honey Creek watershed, Wisconsin, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5, 16 U.S.C. 1005, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1634. A letter from the Chairman, National Council on the Arts, transmitting first annual report of the Council for 1964-65, pursuant to the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1635. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary (for Enforcement), Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to section I of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 11303. A bill to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1103). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11216. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 594. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 595. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 596. Resolution

authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 597. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2020. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11135, a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 599. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2084, an act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems; without amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 600. Resolution providing for the consideration of S.J. Res. 32, joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:
H.R. 11354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H.R. 11355. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:
H.R. 11356. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUIE:
H.R. 11357. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:
H.R. 11358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:
H.R. 11359. A bill to prohibit the erection of fences which will impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):
H.R. 11360. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize professional personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to receive honoraria without regard to the provisions of section 209 of title 18 of the United

States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:
H.R. 11361. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows who are now ineligible for such a pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:
H.R. 11362. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ERLBORN:
H.R. 11363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:
H.R. 11364. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 11365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:
H.R. 11366. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CAHILL:
H.R. 11367. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CURTIS:
H.R. 11368. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:
H.R. 11369. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLBORN:
H.R. 11370. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:
H.R. 11371. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON:
H.R. 11372. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEITH:
H.R. 11373. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McDADE:
H.R. 11374. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 11375. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11376. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 11377. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 11378. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11379. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11380. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 11381. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11382. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 11383. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 11384. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11385. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 11386. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11387. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 11388. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 11389. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H.R. 11390. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide certain free mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 11391. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide certain free mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11392. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide certain free mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11393. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide certain free mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11394. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 11395. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 11396. A bill to authorize the award of a congressional citizenship patch to Boy

Scouts who have earned the four citizenship merit badges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11397. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 11398. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11399. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 11400. A bill for the relief of Maria Isabella Galicinao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 11401. A bill for the relief of Mafalda D. Floreancig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11402. A bill for the relief of Aldo Margoroli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 11403. A bill for the relief of Wah Fat Won (also known as Suey Hong Won); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11404. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Monteroso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11405. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kameyo Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 11406. A bill to incorporate the Cradle of Forestry in America, Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

274. The SPEAKER presented a petition of J. B. Stoner, Augusta, Ga., relative to an investigation being conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**Nigerian Independence Day, October 1,
1965**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Federal Republic of Nigeria marks its fifth anniversary as an independent state, and we should take this opportunity to extend our warmest congratulations to the people of Nigeria, to their president, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, and to their able representative in Washing-

ton, the Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Goodwin Onyegbula.

Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa. Its population of 55 million exceeds the population of the entire northeastern United States by approximately 10 million. Our country, which is historically proud of its diversity, seems relatively homogeneous when compared to the over 100 different tribal groups, many speaking languages foreign to their neighbors, which inhabit geographically diverse Nigeria.

The Nigerians have chosen a Federal and democratic form of government, one which has given considerable emphasis to the problems of developing a sound economy in the framework of a free society. Because of the road which Nigeria

has chosen to travel on the way to development, this country has drawn our interest and elicited our active encouragement.

Nigeria has committed significant amounts of its own resources to the important problem of securing a richer life for its people through rapid, but controlled, economic development. These resources have included money and materials, but have not neglected the time, human energy, and careful thought necessary for a rational approach to improvement. The contribution of its own resources to the creation of an overall plan for development has increased its ability to absorb and effectively utilize both assistance from foreign governments and foreign private investment.